

ton, Walcott, Solon, Iowa City, West Liberty, Dixon, Eldridge, Long Grove, Lyons, Princeton, Camanche, Muscatine, Victor, Ladora, Oxford, Parnell, North English, Williamsburg, Marengo, and others of the second district of Iowa, asking that tax be sage of bill to prohibit exportation of munitions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Wolff Worsted Mills and Stillwater Worsted Mills, of Harrisville, and Narrow Fabric Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of the State of Minnesota, urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Papers to accompany bill for pension for Carrie Farnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of piano manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, favoring passage of Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of women of 76 chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William H. Hubbell Camp, No. 4, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Jennings Lace Works, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of William H. Richardson and others, Standard Waste Manufacturing Co., Goodman Bros. & Hinlim, John Hamilton & Sons, Pine Tree Silk Mills Co., William Brown & Co., Hancock Knitting Mills, all of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Citizens Committee for Food Shipments, relative to refusal of France to allow shipments of condensed milk; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Comision Reguladora del Mercado de Henequen, relative to investigation of harvester combine in Yucatan, Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Workmen's Circle, favoring resolution offering mediation to belligerents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Papers to accompany House bill 9185, granting a pension to Martha A. Knapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9186, for the relief of George W. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Southbridge Printing Co., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rockwell Woolen Co., of Leominster, Mass., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Edwin Bartlett Co., of North Oxford, Mass., indorsing House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Perry Yarn Mills, of Webster, Mass., indorsing House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Naquoy Worsted Mills, of West Rutland, Mass., favoring House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWERS: Papers to accompany House bill 9390, granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Henry P. Horton, president Associated Charities of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring passage of the Keating child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition relative to House bill 702, a bill to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Protest of members of Rice Creek Grange, No. 1470, against increasing the appropriation for a larger Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Michigan Carton Co. and Standard Paper Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring legislation to make the United States independent of any other nation for its dyestuffs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper from George E. Dean, Albion, Mich., favoring establishment of a nonpartisan tariff board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 5591, for relief of Florence Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of H. A. Witthoft and others, of Pocatello; J. A. Schlichting and others, of Twin Falls; and Andrew Huber and other citizens, all of Idaho, favoring passage of bill to prohibit exportation of munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7409, to increase the pension of Alexander Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Hon. Theodore Turner, of Pocatello, Idaho, and 96 others, urging legislation providing for the relief of the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Levi Slinker and 195 citizens of Canyon County, Idaho, protesting against law restricting use of the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Sandpoint, Idaho, urging legislation providing a world federation with the view of bringing to a close the war in Europe and secure perpetual peace throughout the civilized world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Papers to accompany H. R. 8769, a bill for the relief of the heirs of James S. Rollins; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of Orange Grove Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against any increase of armament for war purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles Branch of National Security League, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Church of the People, of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against any increase of armaments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Easton Finishing Co. and Stewart Silk Co., of Easton, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of citizens of first congressional district of Massachusetts, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Byron, Weston & Co., of Dalton; Crocker, McElwain & Co., Chemical Paper Manufacturing Co., and American Writing Paper Co., of Holyoke, Mass., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 21, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Joseph H. Crocker, D. D., of Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, we worship Thee as the Maker of heaven and earth. We praise Thee as the Creator of all tribes and peoples. We honor Thee as the Ruler of all nations. We thank Thee most gratefully for all the gracious blessings of our daily life. And now, as Representatives of this great Nation here assembled in Congress, we ask for the guidance of Thy spirit, even the spirit of Jesus Christ, that we may enact wise laws; that we may promote and protect the sacred privileges of our glorious country; and that we do something to establish justice more firmly throughout the world. And unto Thy great and high and glorious name we give honor, glory, and thanksgiving, now and forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the resignation of a member of a committee. The Clerk will report it:

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS,
Washington, January 20, 1916.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am unable to attend to the duties as member of the Claims Committee. As chairman of the Pensions Committee I am overwhelmed with work, with a large personal correspondence besides, and I shall have to resign as a member of the Claims Committee, owing to the fact that I can not do justice to that committee.

I trust my place will be filled and my resignation accepted without delay.

Very sincerely, yours,

ISAAC R. SHERWOOD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House another resignation, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1916.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Recently the House of Representatives honored me with my election to a place on the Banking and Currency Committee, and also to a place on the District of Columbia Committee, and also to a place on the Patents Committee.

Because of the work I am both inclined and compelled to do upon the Banking and Currency Committee—particularly at this session, when it has under consideration the important matter of rural credits legislation—I am not able to attend the meetings and perform my share of the work upon either the Patents Committee or the District of Columbia Committee, and I accordingly hereby tender my resignation as a member of both the Committee on Patents and the Committee on the District of Columbia, and urgently request to be relieved at once from service on either or both of said committees.

Respectfully submitted.

JOE H. EAGLE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a statement from Mr. Breckinridge Jones, of St. Louis, in regard to a resolution for investigating sisal loans.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. Breckinridge Jones, of St. Louis, on sisal loans. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9416, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9416, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the emergency caused by the infectious nature and continued spread of the destructive disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, and to pay such expense and employ such persons and means, including not exceeding \$2,000 for personal services in the city of Washington, and to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose, \$300,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. So that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] may make a short statement in reference to this canker-disease appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, Congress last winter appropriated \$35,000 to enable the Department of Agriculture to initiate on a comprehensive scale the work of eliminating the citrus canker in certain States in the South. A disease of citrus fruit trees had been introduced to this country, and at the time the matter was called to the attention of Congress it was shown that the entire citrus-fruit industry was imperiled. The citrus-fruit industry in the State of Florida alone is valued at \$200,000,000.

Last February or March the Legislature of Florida was in session, and, believing that this pest would be controlled and eliminated by the expenditure of \$175,000, the Florida Legislature appropriated that sum. Certain fruit-growers' associations,

State and local, as well as individuals, have expended large sums of money in this work.

The result of the investigations that have been made, however, discloses that it is necessary to make a systematic, organized campaign, and it is estimated that it will take at least \$4,000,000 completely to eliminate this disease and protect the citrus-fruit industry of the country.

The Secretary of Agriculture submitted an estimate to the committee for the balance of the present fiscal year. It is estimated that \$30,000 must be expended during each of the five months in the State of Florida, and \$30,000 for the rest of the year in each of the remaining five States in which the citrus fruit trees are grown and which are affected by the pest. It seems that if any action whatever is to be taken, the appropriation should be adequate to do the work required and make the appropriation of value. The committee, accordingly, recommended the amount stated by the Department of Agriculture as necessary to carry on the work from now until the 30th of June.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withdraws his point of order.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, on this item I want to say only a word.

This item, of course, was subject to a point of order. It was not made in committee, and it has not been made in the House. It was very fully investigated. I indorse all that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has stated.

It is a condition that is found in its worst form in Florida. The States of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in the citrus-growing zone, also have this disease, but in a much smaller degree. It is a disease that has no respect for State lines. The Florida Legislature is not in session and will not be for a year. They have made an appropriation, which the legislature thought was sufficient, but it turns out that it was not sufficient, and many contributions have been made by private individuals. This is the critical time when the fight must be made—during the last half of the fiscal year—and it seems to me, while I am not in favor of rushing in on appropriations of this kind, that the condition is so serious and the threat so great that this estimate of the department for immediate expenditure and during the remainder of this fiscal year demands this appropriation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert a new paragraph after line 19, page 24:

"For the emergency caused by the prevalence and continued spread of the dangerous disease known as rabies among coyotes, wolves, and other animals in the national forests and on other public lands, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease and for the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other animals dangerous to the public health and injurious to agriculture and animal industry where the disease exists, \$75,000, to be expended under the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, upon that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, there is a very serious condition confronting the live-stock growers in the Western States through the outbreak of rabies among coyotes in California, Oregon, Nevada, and now introduced into Utah. The disease is rapidly spreading, and the Department of Agriculture is doing its best under the appropriations made for the fiscal year, but that appropriation is not sufficient. The matter has been placed before the Secretary of Agriculture, and he recommends that an emergency appropriation of \$75,000 be made in order to enable him to more successfully cope with this danger that is menacing the live-stock industry and the health and safety of the people. In this connection I would like to have the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture read, which officially sets out the conditions which demand the appropriation asked for. No one should require any further argument as to the urgent necessity for this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 12, 1916.

Hon. JOSEPH HOWELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOWELL: I have your letter of January 6 concerning the rabies situation in Oregon, California, Nevada, and parts of Utah.

Rabies among coyotes and other wild animals in the Northwestern States appears to have originated in northeastern Oregon or southeastern Washington about 1910. Since that time it has spread toward the south through southeastern Oregon, northeastern California, Idaho, and Nevada, and is now threatening Utah. Reports agree that people

and also many domestic animals have been bitten. There appear to be considerable losses of live stock. The animals in which rabies were reported to have developed in that region are dogs, coyotes, cats, horses, cattle, sheep, and hogs.

The area in which rabies is now known to be present among coyotes covers a distance of approximately 400 miles from north to south and 250 miles from east to west. It is likely that the area will extend. It would be impracticable completely to destroy coyotes from this area, or even from a portion of it, in a short time without an expenditure that would probably be prohibitive. It is thought that the coyotes can be killed in sufficient numbers to reduce the danger from them, provided the State authorities will at the same time adopt adequate measures of control, such as a drastic muzzling law for dogs and the proper control of other domestic animals.

The appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture for 1916 carried an item of \$280,000 for certain general purposes and provided that of this amount not less than \$125,000 shall be used on the national forests and public domain in destroying wolves, coyotes, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry. Under this appropriation the Western States have been divided into districts, each in charge of an inspector who is employing a force of hunters and trappers to destroy coyotes and other predatory animals. The work is being conducted in Utah, Nevada, Idaho, California, Oregon, and Washington. Owing to the extent of the rabies epidemic in Nevada the number of hunters employed in that State has been increased to 50. In all the States mentioned the employees of the department are cooperating, so far as possible, with local officials. The amount available for attacking the rabies problem is small and inadequate, and the plans already made exhaust our available funds. We can not discontinue the work we are now doing in the general field. In fact, our plans have progressed so far as to make it impracticable to abandon them, and, furthermore, the wording of the authorization would seem to preclude the department from devoting the entire appropriation to the destruction of coyotes. If the rabies situation is to be attacked properly, an emergency appropriation will have to be made. The department probably could efficiently expend for this purpose in the neighborhood of \$75,000 by the beginning of the next fiscal year, and the experts are of the opinion that a continuing appropriation of \$200,000 might result in such a reduction of the coyotes as to confer great relief, provided, of course, as I have stated, the States cooperate satisfactorily.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, at a live-stock convention, held in Salt Lake on the 15th of this month, at which delegates from the surrounding States were in attendance, notice was taken of this condition, and the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas for many years the loss of sheep and lambs from the depredations of wild animals has proved a menace to the prosperity of western sheepmen; and

Whereas there exists at this time in several of the Western States a dangerous disease known as rabies, affecting the coyote, making this animal perfectly fearless and a dangerous menace to all classes of live stock and poultry (30 head of feeding young steers having been bitten in one feed yard, as reported by a representative of the Biological Survey). Also a dangerous menace to all human beings, especially women and children. Thirty-three persons, as reported by the same authority, are now being treated at Reno, Nev., having been bitten by affected animals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urgently request all flockmasters to devote a portion of their time to the eradication of these dangerous pests, and that we petition Congress at the present session for an appropriation of \$500,000 to be used by the Biological Survey in the eradication of predatory wild animals.

Mr. Chairman, the live-stock interests pay into the Treasury of the United States over a million dollars a year for grazing privileges on the national forests. The Government owns and controls more than 80 per cent of the territorial area where this disease is prevalent. It seems to me that it is a condition that calls for the careful consideration of the House because it not only affects, disastrously, the live-stock interests but it menaces and threatens the health and lives of the people. We feel that we have a claim that ought to appeal to the sense of justice and fairness of the House.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. What is the method employed in using this money to combat this disease?

Mr. HOWELL. The only method now employed is the employment of hunters in cooperation with various States to go out and kill these animals. My amendment proposes that the department shall take into consideration the adoption of other successful means by which these animals can be destroyed and the disease eradicated.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly inform the committee what action the State has taken toward the eradication of this pest?

Mr. HOWELL. Recently there was held a convention of live-stock growers in my State, in connection with a convention of the various boards of health convened by the governor, where the imminent danger of this disease spreading in Utah was fully discussed and rigid regulations adopted to prevent, as far as possible, the spread of this deadly disease.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much money has been spent for this purpose?

Mr. HOWELL. In my own State there is an annual tax of 4 mills on sheep and goats and 2 mills on horses and cattle, which constitutes a county fund for this purpose. In addition to that there is an appropriation of \$20,000 annually from the State funds to be used for this purpose.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I will.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know whether the States have authority to go into the national forests for this purpose? I suppose they might if they got the permit, but would they otherwise?

Mr. HOWELL. I am unable to answer that question. The rangers are all engaged in killing these animals on national forests, as far as they can. I hope the gentleman from New York will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can not withdraw the point of order. If it were a matter that the department was interested in, it should have made an estimate and sent it to Congress for the money necessary to carry on its public work. If the purpose is to induce Congress to make appropriations by addressing communications to individuals of Congress, it is time it was ascertained. The citrus-fruit matter came before the committee without an estimate by the department. I stated to the gentlemen interested that the committee would not act on the matter unless the department submitted an estimate. None was transmitted, and the statement was made that however desirable it might be the department would not ask Congress to appropriate the money. There was a change of mind and the estimate came. The department has boasted at times that Congress has forced money upon it which the department did not desire, whereas the combined energies of the department were engaged in an effort to induce Congress to appropriate money for certain purposes without complying with the laws with reference to submitting estimates. If the department believes that this appropriation is desirable, it has ample time to submit an estimate and have it considered here and at the other end of the Capitol in a proper way before this bill becomes a law. Under the circumstances I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item of Bureau and Plant Industry I would like to offer an amendment, as follows:

Provided, That no part of this money shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property destroyed in the work of investigating or eradicating this disease.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will say to the gentleman that that amendment is not necessary, because there is no authority to do that. The amendment is so framed that the authority would not be conferred on the department, and, furthermore, the department does not desire the authority, because it is opposed to spending money in that way.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Is the gentleman sure that the paragraph is so drawn that it is not subject to the construction I put upon it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That matter was considered in the committee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from New York knows, as many others do, that there is a persistent demand for money to be used for the very purpose I speak of.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The authority was requested, and a provision was framed which gave that authority; but the department did not submit it in that form and does not wish the authority and does not desire to expend money for the reimbursement of property.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The provision now in the bill is:

For the emergency caused by the infectious nature and continued spread of the destructive disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, and to pay such expense and employ such persons and means—

And so forth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; but that is all limited by the previous wording, which authorizes investigation of methods of eradication and control.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But in lines 12 and 13 we find the following language:

And by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary.

A delegation from the State of Florida and from other States where citrus fruit is grown appeared before the Committee on Agriculture in one of the early days of this session, and one of their suggestions—yes; one of their insistent demands—was that money in large amounts should be appropriated by the Federal

Government for the purpose of paying the value of orchards destroyed, and to reimburse owners of orchards for losses they sustain by the activities of the department and the State authorities in checking the advance of the disease, those methods being partly the destruction of orchards some of which have not yet been affected by the disease.

It is clear enough to me that if this appropriation is made just as it stands an effort will be made to have a part of the money devoted to paying owners of orchards for property destroyed, and if there is any question whatever about the construction to be put upon this paragraph, it ought to be made clear. The amendment I suggest should be added so that it will be clear what the intention of the Congress is, and outline clearly the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture and the limits of his authority as to the use of this money.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The same gentlemen appeared before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like the privilege of offering the amendment so that fuller consideration may be given to the construction of this section, and as to the advisability of making sure the manner in which this money is to be used.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to recur to this paragraph to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not think the gentleman from Michigan is asking unanimous consent for anything of that kind, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The amendment having been offered as a new paragraph—

Mr. MANN. A new paragraph being offered does not prevent going back to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Personally, so that there will be no misunderstanding, the committee is unanimous that no money should be expended for the purpose mentioned.

Mr. MANN. I am not at all sure that the appropriation ought to prevent the expenditure of money for the value of orchards which it may be necessary to destroy in order to prevent the disease being spread.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am. I am very positive about it from the information at hand and for this reason: The information is that in some rare instances it is considered desirable to destroy a few trees in the vicinity of an affected tree which are not affected, but which, as a matter of precaution, it is thought should be destroyed in order to destroy the germs in the surrounding soil. If an individual owns a grove of trees and there are one or two trees in it that are affected, if those trees are not destroyed his entire grove will eventually be destroyed. If to protect his entire property it is deemed advisable to destroy a few sound trees that are not yet affected the owner will have received such an enormous benefit from the destruction of those few trees in the preservation of his entire grove that there would not be any justification, in my opinion, for the Federal Government to reimburse him for the value of those trees.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not so sure about that. I take it that the department would have the authority, as they have in the foot-and-mouth disease, under this appropriation, to probably pay all or, under the practice, a part of the value of affected trees which are destroyed. But it might readily happen that it would be a matter of precaution, a policy more wise to adopt, to destroy some trees which are not affected in order to prevent the spread of the disease, rather than to wait until the disease affects a large number of trees and then destroy them. I am not sufficiently familiar with the disease to be posted upon the subject, but I am sufficiently familiar with it to know that in the opinion of many it may be cheaper and wiser to destroy unaffected trees before they are affected rather than to wait until they are affected in large numbers, which would require the destruction of many more affected trees than the affected and unaffected trees combined in the first place. You have to stop the spread of this disease in some way. It may be that the States in the main ought to do that. That is one of the questions with which we constantly come in contact, but we have adopted all along the line the policy of giving national aid to prevent the spread of disease, which can readily pass from one State to another. This is not merely localized, although it may be local at a particular place. It can be spread, doubtless, by birds, and birds do not know State lines—just as the foot-and-mouth disease is spread. There we pay supposedly one-half of the ordinary value, not the fancy value, of cattle which are destroyed. While I do not think the cases are on all fours, or precisely alike, I can see that there might be good reason for the Government destroying orchards not affected, just as in the city of Chicago years ago, when they had the fire, they blew up houses which

were not afire, just as they will do in every great conflagration—destroy property which is not yet afire in order to stop the fire. Which is it wiser to do, blow up a house to prevent the fire burning that house and many more or wait until the house is afire and the fire has spread over a large number of houses?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in the statute relating to the foot-and-mouth disease authority is specifically given to reimburse by the payment of a certain percentage of the value, I think 50 per cent. Dr. Taylor was asked whether the estimate included any allowance for the payment of trees destroyed. In reply he said:

That is not contemplated by the estimate, and the language of the estimate does not authorize reimbursement for trees destroyed.

Mr. GILLET. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. GILLET. I would like to ask the gentleman whether in his opinion line 12 does not give the department that authority? It says:

By applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The demand for reimbursement is based entirely upon the practice in connection with the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, and in the statute which authorizes the Department of Agriculture to destroy animals specific authority is given to pay for animals destroyed. There is no such statute in this case; there is no such authority. This statute is construed to authorize the continuation of work that is now being done under it, and no demand can be made, and no demand, in my opinion, should be made from my knowledge of the facts.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion or question?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The Federal Government has no power, as I understand it, to authorize the destruction of trees. It must be done by virtue of the police power of the State. There is no power authorizing the killing of cattle. It requires legislation, and we contribute one-half for the destruction of cattle under the authority of the State; but that requires legislation specific, which was given in respect to the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. GILLET. I would like to ask the gentleman whether under this language if the department can apply such methods of eradication as in its judgment is necessary, why can not they go and make an agreement with the owner of the tree that if the Government destroys it it will pay what it is worth? That is what looks to me to be the danger there.

Mr. CANNON. For this reason, that in my judgment we can not place any construction upon it that would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to destroy and pay for the trees. I think it would require specific authority to do that thing; and, as the gentleman from New York has well said, in the hearings, they had no desire for such authority, and I apprehend that the appropriation of \$300,000 will be expended otherwise than through the destruction of property. In fact, that was the belief of the committee after it expressly considered the question of putting a limitation upon the appropriation. Sometimes it is not wise to deal with matters that do not require dealing with.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The CLERK read as follows:

On page 24, after the figures "\$300,000," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "no part of which shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property destroyed or damaged."

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman want to discuss his amendment?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do, if the gentleman pleases.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what it means for me to differ from the distinguished gentlemen who have spoken as to the construction of the statute and as to the necessity of specific legislation if authority is to be conferred upon a department of the Federal Government. I do, however, differ from them as to the construction that can be put on this paragraph, the words in lines 11 and 12, "and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary," and so forth, and to cooperate with States and organizations in the methods that they think advisable to employ. These words, I think, may be so construed as to permit of payment of some of this money to owners of trees destroyed.

Now, I know something of the move that is made to induce Congress to make this appropriation. My table has been loaded

with letters from companies and individuals from the Southern States and from other parts of the country interested in the growing of citrus fruits in the Southern States, and in almost every letter there is suggestion or demand that the Government appropriate money to be used to reimburse owners of property destroyed, because the destruction of property is now thought to be one of the ways, and the principal way, of eradicating this very serious disease. As I stated a few moments ago, one day during the early part of this session of Congress a large delegation of southern gentlemen appeared before the Committee on Agriculture, whose duty it will be later in the session to recommend to Congress an appropriation for this work, and almost everyone who spoke on the subject spoke of the necessity of destroying trees and the duty of the Federal Government to reimburse owners of those trees for loss or damage inflicted upon the owner. And in almost every letter I received reference was made to the fact that the Government had pursued a policy similar to that now demanded respecting the foot-and-mouth disease, and that it was considered that this disease is somewhat similar to that, in that it affects property in more than one State, and the duty devolves upon the Federal Government, as in that case, to reimburse the owners of trees or orchards destroyed or damaged.

So, you see, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is a movement to have Congress appropriate money for the purpose of paying the cost or value of property destroyed, and it is clearly up to this Congress now to determine whether or not it shall embark upon a policy of paying the cost of damage to crops or property wherever or whenever it is thought necessary to destroy it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the appropriation means that there may be a direct payment to the owners of these trees destroyed by the citrus canker?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I mean that, in my judgment, an effort will be made by the owners of property, or associations, or State authorities in the citrus-growing States to have the Federal Government cooperate with the States and pay all or a part of the loss imposed as the result from the destruction of citrus orchards.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was there cooperation in the matter of the chestnut blight?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There was some cooperation in the matter of the chestnut blight.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But there was no payment to the owners for losses sustained. It was simply to stay the spread of the disease.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Well, the gentleman refers to the chestnut disease, and I will tell you something of the history of that. The Federal Government was asked for an appropriation to study that disease, and if possible to learn its cause and source, and a means of overcoming and eradicating it.

The appropriation was made, and investigations were made, and it was determined by officials of the department that the only feasible method to be employed was to destroy infected trees. And that was all that could be done. For a long time officials of the Federal Government, from a highly scientific bureau, were employed in the actual physical labor of cutting down trees, and the expense of destroying the trees was paid out of money appropriated by Congress for the purpose of studying this disease. Later, Congress determined, on the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture, to discontinue that appropriation, because the remedy had been found and because it was simply a matter of physical labor and of expense. And it is the policy of the Committee on Agriculture—it ought to be more than it is—that when the remedy has been found, and it can be applied simply by physical labor and by the outlay of money, the Government has gone as far as it ought to go; the rest should be left to the individuals or to the States in which the work is to be done.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There was no suggestion in the chestnut-blight measure that the owners should be reimbursed for their loss?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There was none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No provision was made for that?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There was none.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman, I believe, is a member of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am.

Mr. CANNON. Under the rules of the House that committee has exclusive jurisdiction touching appropriations of this nature, except in this bill, which is an urgent deficiency bill, where the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction. Is the gentleman seeking to get an expression from the House touching reimbursement by the Federal Government for the destruction of trees in advance of the consideration by the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will say to the gentleman that is not exactly my purpose. I consider the pending provision defective, in its present form dangerous, so have offered this amendment to correct the trouble. I think it is the duty of a Member who has given thought to this matter and sees the defect in the bill to call attention of the House to it. It is an important matter, a question of whether or not this Government is going to embark upon the policy of reimbursing owners for almost any loss they may suffer on account of failure of crops or from disease that may attack them.

The door has been opened, Mr. Chairman, by the course pursued by the officials of the Department of Agriculture, perhaps on the authority of Congress, to assist in reimbursing owners of cattle destroyed on account of being afflicted with the foot-and-mouth disease. Now, in my judgment, the two cases are not parallel. It was urged in justification for the use of money for reimbursing owners of cattle that it is an interstate question, that cattle are shipped in interstate commerce, and, therefore, it is proper for the Government to make such regulations and incur such expense as is necessary to protect interstate commerce. There may be some foundation for this contention, but that reason or excuse for use of money in paying for animals will not apply here. This is not an interstate matter. It does not become interstate, Mr. Chairman, simply because the disease appears in more than one State or because by infection or contagion the disease may be carried from one State to another. There is no interstate commerce in orange or lemon trees. There is no danger of spreading this disease if the fruit, the products of these groves or orchards, goes into interstate commerce. The disease is not spread in that way; the products of these orchards and groves and fields are not sent into States where the citrus-fruit industry is carried on. They are sent into States where the industry is not carried on and into which there is no danger of spreading this disease.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose in the effort on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to exterminate this disease this appropriation is made, and he should find it necessary to go into Florida and order the destruction of entire orchards or groves?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Agriculture has no authority, and it can not be conferred upon him, to order destruction of these trees. He might recommend as a method of staying the ravages and possibly of ultimately eradicating the disease, that the infected trees, or near-by trees, be destroyed. He has no authority to order the destruction of the trees. That authority, if it exists at all, rests with the States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose the State and Federal authorities found that it was absolutely necessary to destroy an orange grove in order to arrest the spread of this disease, could any of this money be used for that purpose?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I fear it could be, as the bill now stands. The demand will be made by individuals and authorities of the States for the use of money for that very purpose, and if the Secretary of Agriculture by any construction would be authorized to use the money for that purpose it would be used. The purpose of my amendment is to forbid it, and make impossible the use of money for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object. I am going to support the amendment. There is no use of taking more time.

Mr. AUSTIN. We want some information on this side of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This debate will never be stopped—

Mr. MANN. It is a very important matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman already has had considerable time. I hope he will not ask for more.

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to encourage some of the members of other committees.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This discussion may take all day if it goes on this way, because of the interest of Members in States affected. It is not necessary. This amendment does not do any more than to carry out what was contemplated when the appropriation was made.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will save any time by denying us the right of full discussion.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal in what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] has said on the question of paying for the destruction of these trees. The committee considered that question very carefully at the time they put this item in, and while the members of the committee did not deem the proposed amendment necessary, I do not think they have any particular objection.

As I understand it, no cure has been found, so far, for this citrus canker that has gotten into the citrus groves of this country and has rapidly spread over four or five of the States that have citrus groves. The only way that has been found to control it is to absolutely burn the infected trees—to destroy them by fire. Men go in there, as I understand, especially equipped with suits, and burn every portion of the tree with an oil spray or gas spray, or something of that kind, which destroys the entire tree. It may be that they will destroy more trees than is necessary in order to make a safety zone.

The only reason this amendment was not put in was because it might interfere with the purpose of the appropriation in cooperating with various States and institutions that are carrying on this work. But we have no power to pay for trees or to destroy trees except by a contract or agreement.

The only way we destroyed any cattle was under the police power of the State, and in cooperation with the State, or by an agreement with the owner. Under this law we would have no power. I take it that we may recognize by this amendment that Congress might have the power to pay for the destruction of this property which it does not have. Outside of that, I do not see any objection to the amendment. I think the Government ought to cooperate promptly in eradicating this citrus canker. If we do not do it promptly, we will lose a great deal of the benefits of cooperation.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. There was no purpose on the part of the committee to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize any portion of this appropriation in the payment of damages for destroyed orchards?

Mr. BORLAND. We thought we would leave that question entirely to the Committee on Agriculture. We were asked merely to give an emergency appropriation to cooperate with the States and organizations, which had exhausted the funds which had been given them by the State legislatures and could not at this time secure additional appropriations. We are only to cooperate with them in the work that they are now carrying on. We did not feel that at this time we could regulate or control the character of the work in which they would embark. But if the Committee on Agriculture entered upon a general policy, that committee would be the one to provide a substantive law to regulate it.

Mr. REAVIS. Was it not the purpose of the committee to leave it within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether any part of the appropriations should be used in the payment of damages for destroyed orchards?

Mr. BORLAND. No; it was to be used simply to help out the efforts of the local organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is a very proper one. The only difficulty is that it does not go far enough. The gentleman's amendment, if it were adopted, would prevent the use of these moneys in payment for trees destroyed, but the amendment would not prevent the laying of a claim at any time in the future against the Federal Government for the trees so destroyed.

There is just one way whereby the Federal Government may be relieved from responsibility, and that is by an amendment to this section, under which no part of the appropriation shall be used for the destruction of trees except upon the order of the State authorities.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has suggested that in no event will the Federal authorities have the power or the right to destroy trees unless the local authorities allow it to be done. And yet I feel quite confident that the gentleman would not support an amendment which clearly and definitely provided that no part of the appropriation should be used for the destruction of trees until the local authorities had ordered it done. Such an amendment ought to be adopted. Such an amendment is a proper recognition of the rights of the States; and if such an amendment were adopted, there would be no question about any future claim against the Federal Government for the destruction of trees.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to say that in reporting this appropriation it was the purpose of the committee to make no provision for the payment of destroyed trees. Inquiry was made as to whether the estimate contemplated such a purpose, or whether the department desired to make such payments. The answer was that the department did not desire to make such payments, and the estimate did not cover such authority.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TOWNER. No. I wanted to occupy time in my own right, five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest to the gentleman to wait until I finish. The gentleman should not interrupt me in the middle of a sentence, to take the floor from me. I may have some views of my own.

Mr. TOWNER. I thought the gentleman had concluded.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to take up very much of the time of the committee in discussing the matter. I prefer to eliminate all doubt as to the purpose of Congress in making this appropriation by adopting the amendment proposed.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, it may be that the gentleman from New York can eliminate all difficulty by admitting that this amendment ought to pass. However, I do not agree with him. I do not think that this amendment ought to pass. I believe you will hamper the efforts of the administration of the Department of Agriculture under this provision of the law if you pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt whatever that under the terms of this bill it will be perfectly proper for the Secretary of Agriculture, or those acting under him, to go down into the citrus-fruit country and purchase an orchard that may be along the line of the advance of this citrus-fruit disease. It may be within his power under the terms of this bill to go there and purchase such an orchard and destroy it, and, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment he ought to have that power. Certainly, if that may be considered as a probable or a possible method for the eradication of the disease, the Secretary of Agriculture ought to have the right to experiment and determine whether or not the destruction of certain trees might not stop the advance of this terrible disease; and yet if this amendment should be adopted the Secretary of Agriculture will be estopped from using that method.

Mr. Chairman, I judge that we want the Secretary of Agriculture to use any and all methods that in his wisdom may be deemed best for the purpose of stopping the further spread of this calamity, that may mean the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars to the South and that may mean the absolute ruin of a great many families.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the Secretary of Agriculture ought to have the right, if he so desires, to go down into that country and purchase any of these orchards that he desires, and make any experiments that he thinks will be best for the purpose of determining how to stop the ravages of this disease. If it shall mean the destruction of the trees that he may purchase—and that is the only way in which he could destroy them—then let it be done. I have no fear that this money will

be expended in any other way than legitimately for the purpose of honestly trying to see what effective methods can be put into operation for eradicating this pest. Therefore, I am against the adoption of this amendment that would, in my judgment, seriously hamper the department in its endeavor to ascertain and put in operation the most effective means to stamp out the disease and save to the South and to the Nation the citrus-fruit industry.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree at all with the statement just made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. The proposition involved is a good deal bigger than \$300,000, and, in point of fact, bigger than what might be involved in many times that sum. Stripped of its particular application it is this: Shall the Federal Government, when it intervenes to do a benevolent thing for a locality, be charged not only with the cost of doing that thing, but also be required to compensate the man who happens to suffer from the particular misfortune, in this incident the ravages of a disease affecting his trees?

Mr. TOWNER rose.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, just a minute. I have only five minutes, and I would like to state my side of the case.

Mr. TOWNER. I will not ask the gentleman the question which I had in mind.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is no reason in the world, except the stubbornness of individual men or the parsimony of States, why the Federal Government should be called upon to reimburse owners for the destruction of trees. Why is the Federal Government going in there? Is it going there for its own benefit primarily? No; it is going there because these localities are appealing to it to help them in solving a situation which involves their property. Now, it is exceedingly unfortunate when men find some of their property destroyed through no fault of theirs. It would be very unfortunate for them if they lost their property by fire or if they lost their fruit trees by a killing frost; but if this Government is not only going to take the position of aiding with its intelligence and with its experts in helping to eradicate a particular disease, but is also going to the point of reimbursing the people for the loss that they suffer, then we are entering upon a domain that will tax the capacity of any Government, no matter how rich it may be.

I submit that instead of the amendment going too far, it does not go far enough. If it were practicable at this time, I would like to see an amendment which would require that no tree should be destroyed until the owner thereof agreed that he would make no claim upon the Government. Now, what is the situation that has grown up out of the foot-and-mouth disease? Take the situation in my very State of Kentucky, where a number of very valuable cattle were destroyed. The Government of the United States has paid its half, and so far the State of Kentucky has not paid its half to the citizens of Kentucky, for the destruction of that property. Now, what does that mean? It means just what I spoke of yesterday, that all the time the States are talking about rights and are ignoring duties. They are trying to unload upon Uncle Sam the burden of taking care of the things which primarily belong to them to take care of. I want to use the intelligence of the Department of Agriculture in helping to stamp out this disease, but I am unwilling to see this Government taxed with what will amount to several million dollars by way of paying for trees that may be destroyed.

Why, the gentlemen who came before the committee in this matter did not ask for \$300,000. They asked for two or three million dollars, and we have seen a propaganda over this country, extending to every part of it. Every merchant who had any trade down South with any people who were affected has been written to, and in turn has written to Members of Congress, in order to start a back fire to compel us to appropriate great sums of money. I think the Government goes to the extreme limit of generosity when it furnishes the funds to enable its experts to do down there, and by their advice and aid help these people to stop the ravages of this disease; but to say that we must go further, and compensate every individual who is unfortunate enough to suffer a loss, is to say that we are to enter a realm of paternalism beyond the dreams of anybody in America heretofore. We might as well undertake to insure all citizens against loss that may happen through no fault of theirs, whether it relates to trees, or property, or what not, and that is a theory of government that I will never agree to. For my part, I hope the amendment will be adopted, and I shall vote for it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To equip the new chemical laboratory building, including the construction, purchase, and installation of chemical desks, hoods, cases,

special furniture, and other necessary equipment, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$35,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1917.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have been called from the Hall of the House several times and missed a few paragraphs. I want to ask the gentleman from New York to look back at line 21, page 22, the item which relates to the Postal Service. Will he advise the House whether that appropriation "for regulation screen or other wagon service, \$25,000," has anything to do with pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It does not pertain in any way to curtailment of the existing contracts for the pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am much obliged to the gentleman. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses: For contingent expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, \$20,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The contingent expenses of the Steamboat Service should cover the question of steamboat inspection. There has been some doubt in the minds of the American people whether the Steamboat-Inspection Bureau of the Department of Commerce has performed its duty in the way in which it should be performed. Last summer we had a terrible catastrophe in Chicago in which more than 1,000 lives were lost. The Secretary of Commerce came to Chicago during the investigation that was had in connection with that disaster, and he conducted himself there in such a way as to give everybody reason to believe that he was not in sympathy with a thorough inspection of steamboats.

The people of Chicago were appalled as a result of this disaster, and yet in the face of all the death and sorrow and suffering which resulted from that, it was apparent that no sympathetic ear was given to the people who were interested in protecting the lives of those who travel on steamboats by anybody connected with the Department of Commerce, and particularly that branch known as the Steamboat-Inspection Service. The hearings before the Committee on Appropriations in connection with this suggested appropriation indicated that this \$20,000 is requested because of the number of additional ships that have been transferred from the foreign to the American flag. But there is no indication of any evidence in the hearings that any account has been taken of the needs of the service where life should be protected.

The statement made by those who came before the committee for this appropriation was to the effect that if they did not receive more money the sailing of the ships would be delayed. There was no suggestion from anyone in power as to the need for better protection of life. The people of the community from which I come feel justly aggrieved at the attitude of the Department of Commerce in the investigation caused to be made of this appalling disaster.

[The time of Mr. MADDEN having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.]

We feel that the time has come when public officials in high places should be in sympathy with the people of America, and particularly in cases of the kind I have described.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; for a question.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman is not going to ask for an appropriation to pay damages for the loss of lives on the *Eastland*?

Mr. MADDEN. We are not going to ask for any appropriation, but we are going to ask for decent treatment by the officials of the Department of Commerce. [Applause.] When the people of a community are appalled by such a disaster as Chicago witnessed they expect their public servants, when they come to the community, to treat the people of the community with decency and respect [applause] and give some evidence of their sympathy with the sorrows of the people of that community.

I want now and here to protest against the attitude of the Secretary of Commerce in his investigation into the conditions that surrounded the disaster, and I want the executive branch of the Government having control over steamboat inspection to see that that inspection work is organized and carried on in the future so as to protect the lives of the American people. I want Secretary Redfield to know that we in Chicago, at least, do not approve of his attitude during the time that this investigation was being made by him, and if we had our way we would ask for his resignation from the Cabinet on account of the insulting attitude he assumed toward the people who had wives, daughters, brothers, and sisters lying dead on the decks

where this terrible disaster occurred. We want Mr. Redfield to know that he is only an individual, and that as an individual, a member of the Cabinet though he be, he is still a servant of the people, and we expect him to give the people whose servant he is the evidence of his sympathetic feeling and that character of feeling that the master has a right to expect from a man. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there is no justification for the very severe assault made on the Secretary of Commerce. The *Eastland* disaster in Chicago was a most unfortunate one. A large number of women and children who had boarded an excursion steamer lost their lives. My recollection is that it was due to the fact that the water at the wharf where the steamer was tied up was quite shoal, and the officers in charge of the boat had emptied the water ballast tanks, so as to lie alongside this particular wharf.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a moment. So when a large number of persons went on the boat and got upon one side the boat careened, overturned, and a large number lost their lives. At any rate, whatever may have been the actual cause of the disaster, as soon as it was known the Secretary of Commerce, believing that it was a disaster of appalling extent, personally went to the city of Chicago with a number of his assistants in order to ascertain, if it could be ascertained, just what caused the disaster and who, if anyone, was responsible for it. The conditions in Chicago were not as calm and placid as they would be under ordinary circumstances. The Secretary and his assistants were very much misunderstood, maligned, and abused by the people whom he was attempting to serve.

Mr. MADDEN. We deny that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There were brought to Chicago from different parts of the United States steamboat inspectors who had no local interest whatever and were supposed to be entirely free from any bias or prejudice resulting from location, in order to make an exhaustive investigation and ascertain what the facts actually were. That investigation was conducted. A report has been made and transmitted to the Speaker of this House, and it is now an official document of the House of Representatives. As a result of that report, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and his committee have reported a bill to add the necessary employees in the Steamboat-Inspection Service.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, that report, with the testimony taken, was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the report and all the testimony taken by the board in Chicago have been printed by the committee and are now available to any Member who may be interested in the facts. A bill has also been introduced, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, and is pending before the committee, on which hearings will be had in the near future, providing for the creation of a board of naval architects to superintend the construction of ships, the better to safeguard their stability and seaworthiness. The immediate cause of that disaster has never been officially ascertained. Judge Landis, United States district judge at Chicago, took the investigation out of the hands of the Steamboat-Inspection Service and had the witnesses all subpoenaed before the Federal grand jury and forbade the Steamboat-Inspection Service, under penalty of contempt of court, to further call these witnesses before them or proceed with the investigation. For that reason it was halted and only a partial investigation has been made. If the facts warrant, a congressional investigation may be made; but I think that in connection with this bill all of the material facts connected with that unfortunate and appalling disaster will be developed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, those who are acquainted with the Secretary of Commerce know that whatever differences men may have with him because of his political affiliations, he is a man of integrity, intelligence, high purpose, and desires to perform the duties of his great office to the very best of his ability. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is not surprising that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], if he had his way, would ask him to resign from the Cabinet. Mr. Chairman, if he had his way he would have every Democratic member of the Cabinet resign or eliminated in any way possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I feel that owing to the fact that I have known the Secretary of Commerce for over 20 years, I can not allow to go unchallenged the statements made about his investigation of the *Eastland* disaster. I wish to add my word to that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] in commendation

of the high character of the Secretary of Commerce. Though we may differ with him at times, as the gentleman from New York said, on his political opinions or convictions, I know him to be a man of exceptionally high character, and I can not for a moment allow to go without a challenge the statement that he would be hard-hearted or adamant to the sufferings of anybody, much less women and children. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I take exception to any general statement about any man—be he a Member of this House or a member of the Cabinet, be he of high or low degree. I think that when a statement is made about a man it should be backed up by particulars and that generalizations should not be accepted as true.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will back up the statement with particulars by asking an investigation. That is what we wish, and we will prove the statement that I made to be true.

The Clerk read as follows:

Claims for damages: To pay the claims for damages which have been considered, adjusted, and determined to be due to the claimants by the Commissioner of Lighthouses, under authority of the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 17, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 537), on account of damages occasioned by collision for which vessels of the Light-house Service have been found responsible, certified to Congress at its present session in House Document No. 541, \$53.39.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new section, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 2, on page 27, add the following:

"Rural sanitation: For special studies of, and demonstration work in, rural sanitation, including personal service, to continue available during the fiscal year 1917, \$100,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to this extent, that it can not be introduced as a new section in the middle of another section. There is but one section to this bill.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer it as a new paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Then I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, this item was estimated for, and was before the subcommittee. The subcommittee differed with me about the item and it went out of the bill. The purpose of the item is to enable the Medical Department of the Government to establish a system of rural inspection, notably for the purpose of enabling the Government to successfully stamp out pellagra, the horrible disease which the Medical Department shows to exist in 44 of the 48 States of the Union. In the single State of South Carolina last year there were reported 56,000 cases. The medical authorities of the Government have stated the only cure for this disease is that the proper diet be given to the patient. Therefore, the purpose is to enable people to know how to prepare properly the food diet, to know what a well-balanced meal is.

The object of this appropriation is to take typical counties, and in cooperation with the health authorities of the State and county, make that county free from any of those conditions which would tend to produce disease. If the work which the Agricultural Department does as a whole is within the power and scope of the Federal Government, then, indeed, this work could be done by the Federal Government if in the wisdom of Congress it is a proper item of expense, because I do not believe the authority would be questioned now, although in the past it has been questioned, in reference to the Agricultural Department. All of the activities of that department are directed along lines similar to this in reference to crops, soil improvement, the proper care of animals, and unquestionably, if that is true, then the Health Department of the Government can, as a matter of education, as a matter of proper direction for the State authorities to follow, make such suggestions and aid and assist in this work. I do not know, nor can you find from any of the authorities, the number of cases of pellagra in the United States—it is in 44 of the 48 States—and as a matter of economy, as a matter of good business, this appropriation should be made, because that which tends to preserve the health of the people tends to promote their business activities and success. In the great cities where they have a congested population they have a thorough city inspection and sanitation, and the city authorities look after the matter. It pays there and it will pay in the country. It is not intended here that the Federal Government should establish the sanitation, but that they should aid and assist in endeavoring to get the people informed of what is proper sanitation around the country home. As soon as that is established the matter is taken up by the State and county authorities and they then continue the work of sanitation. What would become of the great cities if each home owner were left to himself?

If it were not for the fact that they have city health authorities who looked after the sanitation of premises and have the right to cause the owners of the premises to make them sanitary, the health of the city would be much impaired and the death rate greatly increased.

Now, as a beginning, information which the medical department of this Government has obtained in reference to country sanitation, in reference to the preservation of life, in reference to the discovery of diseases that are brought about by germ or infection—such information given to the various health bodies of the counties and States by the Department of Health in Washington would be a great step toward getting a proper rural sanitation through the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to discuss the point of order. I simply want to express the appreciation of the people of the State of Mississippi, particularly, and I think that is true of the other Southern States, of the great work which has been done by the Public Health Service, particularly that under the direction of Dr. Goldberger. This disease—pellagra—is of relative recent appearance in our part of the country; and while the doctors say it is not contagious, it has spread to an alarming extent and is a most deadly disease.

Dr. Goldberger, of the Public Health Service, three years ago began an investigation of it, and by a diligent, persistent, and scientific investigation he has practically demonstrated that pellagra can be prevented and can be cured.

That discovery, while it will save thousands of lives in the State of Mississippi and the other Southern States, will also add materially to the prosperity of those States by the prevention of the further spread of this disease.

I take this much time simply to pay this well-deserved compliment to Dr. Goldberger. I do not care to discuss the point of order at all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am in thorough sympathy with the work done by the Public Health Service, a service which has always been a sort of pet of mine ever since I have been in Congress. In the last Congress the House passed a bill to give to the Public Health Service authority over rural sanitation. That bill did not become a law. Such a bill is now pending in the House before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If that bill does become a law, then there will be authority of law for making this appropriation. There is no such authority now. That is one of the points of order I make. Another which I make, and which I know will appeal to my friend from Mississippi, is that orderly procedure in the consideration of appropriations is always desirable and required by the rules. This is a deficiency appropriation bill, and it provides under the heading of the Department of State for various deficiencies in the State Department. It provides under the heading of the Treasury Department for various deficiencies in the Treasury Department, among which is an item for the Public Health Service, and it provides for deficiencies in other departments until it gets down to the Department of Commerce, and in the middle of the paragraph relating to the Department of Commerce this amendment is offered for a deficiency in the Public Health Service, which is in the Treasury Department. It has no place in the bill. If it should be inserted in the bill in this place it would be an item of expenditure under the Department of Commerce and the Lighthouse Service for a bureau which is in the Treasury Department, and the Chair has always held every time such a question arose that gentlemen who wish to offer amendments on an appropriation bill must offer them in the appropriate place. The appropriate place for this amendment to be offered was on page 18, in line 5, and as we are now on page 27, in the Department of Commerce, following the Lighthouse Service, and just preceding the Department of Labor, the amendment is not in order in this place in the bill, and, there being no authority of law, would not be in order in any other place.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any authority of law for this appropriation, but I will state that the reason this amendment is not offered in the proper place in this bill is that I was not in the Chamber at the proper time, because the legislative bill was being considered, and I was in the room of the Committee on Appropriations, and that item had been passed when I came in. If no point of order is made and it is adopted, I will ask unanimous consent to put it in at the proper place in the bill, if the gentleman will give me an opportunity to take a vote on it, and I think the gentleman should not insist upon that point of order unless it is because he is opposed to the item.

Mr. MANN. I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to inserting this item in this bill at this time at any place. I am in favor of passing a law, by the way, giving the Health Bureau the right to do this service.

Mr. Sisson. I will state for the benefit of the committee that there are a number of gentlemen who have been engaged in this work, as I understand, on another appropriation carried under another head, but that appropriation is a very small one, and the medical department has organized a number of young physicians, who have been through a course here in the city of Washington, and not to give them this money at this time would mean that this would cease. But if they can get the \$100,000 at this time, and Congress will pass the law which the gentleman has in mind, then there would not have to be a complete reorganization of the service again.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the reason I make the point of order on this paragraph is because I think the departments of the Government should recognize the fact that when Congress makes an appropriation for a particular purpose it is their duty to expend it during the fiscal year and not to organize a service which will expend it in a few months, and then come to Congress and say, "We have this service organized under an appropriation which has been made, and if you do not give us more money than you intended our service will be demoralized and disorganized." That is not the province of the departments of the Government. It is their business to expend the money which we appropriate for them, and not tell us in the middle of a year that they have organized a service which is going to be demoralized if we cease giving more money. [Applause.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MANN. No; I am not mistaken, because I know what this is. I have talked with these gentlemen.

Mr. Sisson. Now, the authority under which they did this work, however, was an item for the purpose of investigating the diseases of man, and this was the method under which they did that work. Now, in the expenditure of that money for the investigation of the diseases of man that fund became exhausted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. They knew whether it would become exhausted or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They wanted to do more than they can do under the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I have talked with the Public Health Service, which has been carrying on this work. I have no doubt it has been done well and that it is a valuable work. They have made sanitation surveys of a number of the counties throughout the United States—some in West Virginia, some in Kentucky, as I now recall, and some in other States. If this appropriation should become available, I am informed by the State health officers in the State of Illinois that a county in Illinois would receive this health survey. I will be very glad to have it made, but I think the departments of the Government, knowing what money they have to expend, even when they find that it is a good work, ought only to expend the money that we appropriate for them. If we want to appropriate a larger amount next year, very well. We can not appropriate enough to have a health survey in every county in the United States. That is an impossibility. The counties that get it get a special favor. While we do some of that, \$100,000 will not do all. Let them live within their means. If the Public Health Service wants to develop its possibilities, it ought to lay its case before the Committee on Appropriations and abide by their judgment, and not seek to get Congress to appropriate money to which they are not lawfully entitled.

Mr. Sisson. Now, Mr. Chairman, if this item goes into this deficiency bill they become lawfully entitled to it, and if it were not for the point of order I do not believe that the committee would vote this item down. I may be entirely mistaken about it, but I do believe that this work appeals to every Member of Congress in the House, because if there is one thing that the Agricultural Department or the Medical Department can do in reference to animals and food, for the purpose of preserving them, then the Government can preserve those people for whom these very departments exist; and if this service is proper service, we ought not to permit work of this kind to suffer solely because it happens to be that a point of order can be made against it. I have no censure against these gentlemen who make the points of order. I believe in orderly legislation, but in deficiency bills there is usually a great deal of disorder. A great deal of it may be occasioned by the disorder in the departments, but it has been the custom of Congress for years to pass these deficiency bills, and if in this bill at this time this money can be provided so that now in the winter and spring months, when the

disease is most easily arrested and the work can be most easily done, when the sanitation can be done at the earliest possible moment for the purpose of preventing the spread of the disease, then, indeed, this item ought to be included in this deficiency bill at this time until Congress can make provision for whatever activities they feel the Federal Government ought to enter into in reference to the preservation of the health of the country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would not say a word more except that the gentleman says there are so many items in the deficiency bills which have no warrant of law. The gentleman must know that that is an extravagant statement. Nearly every item in this deficiency bill is an item where there is warrant of law and requirement of law that departments do something and there is not enough money to carry on the work that Congress has directed them to do. If that were the case here it would be perfectly proper to make a deficiency appropriation. One item of the bill where that rule does not apply is the citrus case, and that was a case of emergency. Now, in this case there is no emergency, no requirement of law. There is no special reason for making a deficiency appropriation except that the gentlemen think the work is a good thing. Well, it is no more valuable now than it would have been 10 years ago; it is no more valuable now than it will be 10 years hence, so far as that is concerned. It is valuable work that ought to be carried along progressively, a part at a time. It is impossible to do it all at once, and the Bureau of Health had no business to make a deficiency estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he is very much in sympathy with the purposes of the amendment, but there being no authority of law for this appropriation, he is forced to sustain the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of costs assessed by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in the case of All Gagliardi and another against Byron H. Uhl, as acting commissioner of Immigration at the port of New York, \$126.40.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to charge against the appropriation "Expenses of regulating immigration" for the fiscal year 1915 not exceeding \$15,000 for articles purchased for use during that period pursuant to orders placed during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] what that first paragraph means, and also the second, on page 27, line 19.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was a case in which a writ of habeas corpus was sued out to obtain the discharge of an immigrant who was detained at Ellis Island. The matter was carried up to the United States Supreme Court and the writ was sustained. The costs, amounting to \$126, were entered in the judgment against the individual who happened to be acting as Commissioner of Immigration. The writ so issued to the commissioner was really against the United States. The custom is for the United States Government to pay the costs in legal proceedings of this character, instead of letting them lie against the official of the Government for the performance of his official duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay, etc., of the Army, \$119,833.89.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 32, in line 24, after the sum of "\$119,833.89," insert the following:

"Provided, That the limitations on the time for filing claims for arrears of pay, bounty, or other allowances growing out of the service of Volunteers who served in the Army of the United States during the Civil War or the War with Spain are repealed: *Provided further*, That hereafter no agent or attorney shall demand or accept for his services in connection with the prosecution of claims for arrears of pay, bounty, or other allowances due on account of the service during the war with Spain of an officer or enlisted man of the Regular or Volunteer Armies of the United States filed after the passage of this act any fee for any service rendered in connection therewith. Whoever shall violate this provision upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$500 or imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months, or both, and shall be disbarred from practice before the Treasury Department."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order upon the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, by a provision of the act of December 22, 1911, on an urgent deficiency bill—and this is an urgent deficiency bill—there was legislation that placed a limitation as to the filing and adjudication of claims for back pay and bounty for soldiers of the Union in the Civil War after December 31, 1912. It was also provided that no agent should

receive compensation for acting as such on claims filed after December 22, 1911, and a severe penalty was provided as against agents who violated the provisions of that act.

There were 2,200,000 men enlisted in the Union Army before the Civil War ceased. Prior to the act of 1911 agents and attorneys, procuring lists of soldiers, sent to soldiers circulars advising them that they had claims for back pay or bounty, or both, and soliciting employment, exacting frequently from one-fourth to one-half of the amount that they alleged to be due, and frequently demanding an advance of \$1 or more to pay postage and expenses of correspondence. These circulars brought a great amount of business to the agents soliciting employment, and in the aggregate a large amount of money was advanced to cover postage and expenses of correspondence. In many instances, perhaps a majority, there was nothing due to the soldier.

The act of 1911 cut off all such petty graft, and rendered unlawful the employment of agents in the premises. Such employment was never necessary; but in my judgment the limitation that was placed upon the filing and adjudication of claims by soldiers should not have been enacted, and I believe that act of limitation should be removed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there is still some money due the veterans of the Civil War that they were unable to obtain by reason of this bar of the statute of limitations?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; for back pay and bounty. I have investigated two cases myself. There are possibly many thousands of just claims barred by this limitation. The gentleman must recollect that there were 2,200,000 men who were under pay, and a good many of them, perhaps the larger portion of them, were entitled to bounty as well. Most of them have been paid. I apprehend the amount will not be very large that is unpaid, but after waiting for the money, they ought not to be denied that which was due them for their service for the perpetuation of the Union.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I entirely agree with the gentleman, and if I understand the purpose of his amendment it is, first, to remove the bar of the statute of limitations created by the act now in force, and, second, to prevent the claims agents from absorbing most of the amounts.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; the act of December 22, 1911, as to soldiers of the Civil War contains that penalty, so that it is not necessary to reenact the same; but the latter part of the amendment removes the bar as to soldiers of the War with Spain and puts in a proviso "hereafter," and so forth. I apprehend we could not say "heretofore," because that might be interfering with the freedom of contract; but we can do it as to the hereafter, and we have done it in pension legislation time and again—limiting the fees.

I hope the gentleman from New York will not make a point of order. This amendment has been prepared with some care, after examination, and inasmuch as the legislation went upon the urgent deficiency bill in 1911, from the moral and equitable standpoint it seems to me it might be amended upon this urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the legislation referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was incorporated in an urgent deficiency bill in December, 1911, as the result of statements made by the Auditor for the War Department, from which it appeared that very gross abuses were connected with the presentation and prosecution of these claims. If I recall what was stated at the time, it then appeared that practically none of the men who took part in the Civil War were presenting these claims, but their heirs were being drummed up by claim agents and exorbitant fees were being taken for the prosecution of the claims, when the only thing necessary was to write a letter to the Auditor for the War Department making the claim, and the amount due was computed by the auditor from the records in the department and certified for payment.

Congress determined to give an additional year in which these claims might be filed, and then to bar them. That gave 50 years from the time the claims accrued in which they might be presented against the United States Government. There may be some few cases where survivors of the war have ascertained that they have these claims and desire to present them. Personally I would have no objection to legislation by which these men might be taken care of, but I can not consent to repeal in this way and wipe out this bar and to start up the old practices. Regardless of the penalties, the men who make a specialty of presenting claims of this character will find some way to evade the statute. They are men who have had the

heartlessness to take 50 per cent of these claims simply for writing a letter to the Auditor for the War Department. While these claims aggregate very enormous sums, they are for very small individual amounts in the very great majority of cases, and in no instances are they for very large sums. I can not consent, as the gentleman well knows, to a provision repealing this law at this time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I fancy the gentleman will pardon me a little further. No claim agent or attorney could get one cent under this amendment, after the act of 1911, because by that act this kind of graft was cut out by the roots. This amendment leaves the law of 1911 still in force. It merely repeals the limitation contained in that act as to the time in which claims may be presented. The gentleman must recollect that there are from 400,000 to 500,000 of these soldiers still living.

I know about it, because in my own city there is a soldiers' home, and there are from 2,000 to 3,000 soldiers of the Civil War in that home. I have come in contact with them. I have made investigations in two cases. I suppose there are hundreds, and perhaps thousands, who are shut out by the legislation of 1911, by which legislation the Treasury is protected, as it ought to be protected, with a severe penalty against any agent or attorney who would prosecute such a claim. So there is no danger from that standpoint, and it does seem to me that if it is proper to waive the point of order to permit an appropriation of \$300,000 to fight the citrus canker, it is proper to waive the point of order in favor of these men who fought to preserve the Union; and I think my friend will hesitate before making that point of order, especially as this legislation went upon the urgent deficiency bill in 1911 and was passed as we are now passing this urgent deficiency bill through the House. It seems to me, in equity and fairness, that as this limitation can be lifted safely it ought to be lifted, or at least that the House should have an opportunity to express its will. [Applause.] I hope my friend will not make the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this legislation to which the gentleman refers was incorporated in an urgent deficiency bill and it passed this House by unanimous consent.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It passed because of information as to the very gross abuses that were existing. There has been no complaint about that law.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Members of Congress have not found that it has been working an injustice to the old soldiers. The gentleman from Illinois, with four or five thousand old soldiers in a home in his district, found two cases where he believed that an injustice has been done. Now, it may be possible to frame a provision on one of these other bills that will prevent any injustice being done to the old soldiers. No one wishes to do them an injustice, but I shall not consent to wipe out the statute of limitations and permit this money to go to persons other than the men who served in the Civil War.

Mr. CANNON. It does not permit it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It can; and under the law, if this be repealed, the most distant heir of a man who served in the Civil War could go and dig up these claims, as they have been digging them up, instigated by these claim agents.

Mr. CANNON. Not since the act of 1911.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; but the gentleman desires to repeal that act.

Mr. CANNON. I do not. I let the act stand.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CANNON. I have the act here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This provides that the limitation on the time for filing claims is repealed. It is very apparent that this is no way to attempt to legislate. When these provisions are incorporated in these bills and pass the House by unanimous consent, it is the result of very careful investigation and consideration and preparation by a committee, where every phase of the matter can be considered carefully. I shall not consent, because under the obligations imposed upon me in charge of this bill I can not consent to legislation of such a sweeping character, and I insist on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to the gentleman in the greatest kindness that he grows vigilant where an honest debt is due.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not propose to let the gentleman make such remarks as that about me. I insist on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is almost impossible to get consideration from the committee that has jurisdiction touching this matter or from the House, with 30,000 or 40,000 bills soon to be pending, and with great numbers of public bills to take up the attention of the House. I can not make any further appeal to the gentleman. And I will not make any threats. On this very bill we have appropriated \$300,000 to combat the citrus canker; and because of the great necessity for it, no point of order was made against it. I will not make any threats that I will make points of order, but I think the gentlemen might well have allowed the House an opportunity to vote upon that amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the pro forma amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

There was no demand for a separate vote.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an indefinite leave of absence for my colleague Mr. STEAGALL, on account of sickness in his family.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for indefinite leave of absence for his colleague on account of sickness in his family. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Pending that I want to see if we can arrive at some agreement as to how long general debate shall run. Has the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] any suggestion to make?

Mr. DUNN. I think that we on this side would be satisfied with eight hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri and the other half by myself.

Mr. MANN. Make it 10 hours.

Mr. DUNN. I will suggest 10 hours.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to agree to that length of debate, but if there are so many people who desire to speak I suppose we might as well accept it, one half of the time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN].

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 10 hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN]. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, which I do not know that I will do, I will suggest to my friend from Missouri that if he expects to pass this bill and to do anything for good roads, it looks as if we ought to get through pretty soon, because there is other legislation coming up, and it seems to me that the debate ought to close by to-morrow night.

Mr. MANN. When this bill was given a privileged status, it was stated—and that was the understanding—that there

would be liberal general debate allowed on it in view of the fact that there was nothing else coming before the House upon which much general debate could be had at this time. I am in favor of disposing of this bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to pass it as early as possible.

Mr. MANN. I do not think a day or two will make any difference.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] object?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not.

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether he can allow me some time out of his time?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I presume that the gentleman from Missouri will be allowed time. I assured him privately that I would grant him time, but if he wants a public declaration, in order to bind me, I have no objection to giving him that security. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the road question, as far as Federal aid is concerned, first came before the House while the Post Office bill was being considered on the 22d of April, 1912. The gentleman from Missouri, now chairman of the Roads Committee of the House [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], introduced an amendment to the appropriation bill for the conduct of the Post Office Department, providing for an appropriation of \$25,000,000, to be used at the rate of \$15, \$20, and \$30 per mile for the improvement, repair, and maintenance of roads over which the rural mail was delivered.

At that time the record showed that the United States was losing \$28,000,000 a year on the delivery of rural mail. The addition of this \$25,000,000 proposed as an amendment to the bill would make the loss \$53,000,000. I was opposed to the adoption of the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Missouri, and I believe I made a speech against the proposition at that time. Later on the House agreed to the adoption of the amendment, and the appropriation bill for the Post Office Department that year carried this item.

When the bill went to the Senate the Senate disagreed to the item and suggested the appointment of a commission to study the question of Federal cooperation with the State in the matter of constructing roads. The commission, as a result of the Senate suggestion, was appointed, and I had the honor of having a place on that commission. The commission served for about two years, during which time it made an exhaustive study of road building throughout the world. It finally reached the conclusion that it would be wise for the Federal Government to cooperate with the States.

The report of the commission was made to the House and to the Senate. The House adopted a new rule providing for the appointment of a Committee on Roads, of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] was made chairman. That committee reported another bill last year, in which it provided that roads should be classified, running all the way down from macadam, a high-class road, to roads that were made of ordinary dirt worked over by a scraper or drag. This bill provided that \$25,000,000 should be authorized to be expended out of the Federal Treasury in cooperation with the States. The bill, however, was drawn in such a way that if it had become a law the States of the Union would be able to draw the money allotted to them out of the Treasury of the United States without being obliged to use one dollar of the money allotted to the State for the purpose of building roads. The Senate did not agree to this bill.

To-day we have before us a new bill recommending an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to be distributed to the States.

I have not been an enthusiastic advocate of Federal cooperation with the States in road building. Indeed, before I became a member of the commission which made this comprehensive study of the question, I was really opposed to Federal cooperation. But after having gone carefully into the question, I reached the conclusion that if the country was to have the kind of roads to which it is entitled, the Federal Government must cooperate in some way, and so I have evolved with the times, and to-day I am a believer in the wisdom of Federal cooperation in road building. I do not, however, agree that the bill reported by this committee is a wise bill, not that I have any criticism of the committee for reporting the bill in the form in which it is, for I believe that every member of this committee is patriotic and has done the very best that could be done under all of the circumstances. No bill reported by any committee of this House will ever be perfect. I say that not only of bills that refer to Federal cooperation in road building but to bills referring to any governmental activity. So when we legislate upon this question, as upon all other questions, we will find ourselves compelled in some way to compromise our views and take the situation as we find it.

This bill proposes to authorize the expenditure of \$25,000,000, and it provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall be given the power to say whether he will pay 30 per cent, 40 per cent, or 50 per cent of the cost of the road to the State. I do not agree that the Secretary of Agriculture ought to have this discretionary power. What I fear is that, with this discretion placed in the Secretary of Agriculture, no matter how high-minded he may be, he will be influenced by people either in the House or in the Senate, or outside of the House or outside of the Senate, to do the things which he ought not to do. I believe that any legislation enacted for Federal cooperation with the States in building roads ought to be so guarded as to prevent the possibility of political scandal or pork-barrel manipulation, if you please.

The time has come when I believe the Government should cooperate with the States, and to that part of the bill providing that the States shall have the right to initiate the improvements I heartily agree, but I believe that the bill should be so drawn as to reserve to the Congress, the law-making body, whatever discretionary power shall be placed anywhere. Why should we say to the Secretary of Agriculture that we authorize him to use his discretion as to what part of this money shall be used upon any kind of road within the boundaries of any State? What we ought to do is to enact a law that will give to every State automatically, as its right, whatever contribution the Government of the United States pleases to make to road building within the State. What I mean by that is, that when we apportion a given amount to the various States of the Union, whatever amount may be apportioned to a given State should be placed to the credit of that State upon the books of the Treasury Department, and when that State itself has complied with the terms required by the law, the Secretary of the Treasury then automatically must as a matter of law pay to the State the amount so accredited. No State should receive any compensation out of the Treasury of the United States toward the building of its roads until the State itself has expended at least double the amount placed to its credit on the books of the Treasury of the United States. We ought to so safeguard the expenditure of this Government money that no President of the United States, no Senator of the United States, no, not all of the Senators of the United States nor all of the Members of the House combined, should have influence enough to induce the Secretary of Agriculture, or whoever may be placed in charge, to grant any favor to one State and not accord it to every State; that when the States earn the right to the money it shall go to the States, regardless of what the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States, or the House of Representatives may say about it. Why do I say this? We are starting out on a great work. There are 2,300,000 miles of highways in America, and over 1,200,000 miles of those highways the rural mail is carried to-day. The time will come when every mile of these highways will be improved. The law should be so written that when we embark upon this enormous enterprise we will feel certain and the American people will be satisfied that there can be no political scandal as the result of governmental cooperation with the States.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has the gentleman any doubt about the constitutionality of this bill as drawn?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, not being a lawyer, of course I do not enter into the constitutional questions involved, but I am assuming those who are lawyers have decided that question

in the affirmative. Whether we have constitutional authority or not, the time was, away back in 1800, when the returns from the sale of public lands were contributed to the construction of public roads within the States in which the land was sold, and so I assume that if we had the right to do that then we have the right to do it now. But whether we have the constitutional right or not, it seems to me that the time has come when the interests of the public everywhere are best served by united action between the Federal Government and the State government. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that this law, if enacted, will leave it within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to say who shall and who shall not be favored, who shall receive 30 per cent, who shall receive 40 per cent, and who 50 per cent of the money, and that can only be determined as the result of influence that may be brought to bear upon him. I want this law to be so guarded that no man in public life may be able to go to his district and say, "I am influential with the Secretary of Agriculture and I can bring to this district more money than my opponent in this campaign."

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask my colleague on what basis he would apportion the funds?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not complaining about the apportionment. I am not saying whether the apportionment is correct or not. I am simply talking about the method that should be employed after the apportionment is made, the means by which the apportionment, when made, shall go into the treasuries of the States.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. If I understand my colleague, he would apportion according to the population, according to the number of miles in each State. Is not that the provision of the bill now?

Mr. MADDEN. There are three factors in this bill. One factor first gives \$65,000 to each State because it is a State; the second factor is the number of miles of road, and the third factor is the population. The three combined make the basis of apportionment as recommended by the committee.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Now, my colleague would not permit the discretion to be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture, as I understand, but would have the money distributed or go to the credit of each State—

Mr. MADDEN. I would.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. To be paid out automatically.

Mr. MADDEN. Whatever the basis of apportionment may be I do not undertake to say, because I have not gone into that sufficiently thoroughly to justify my giving an opinion upon it, but once agreed upon, a basis of apportionment—and we know there is a certain amount of money coming out of the Government appropriations to a given State—that money should go to the State regardless of what the Secretary of Agriculture may say about it, and he ought not to be given the discretion to say whether 30 per cent of the cost of a given road or 40 per cent of the cost of a given road or 50 per cent of the cost of a given road shall be the proportion that he will pay.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the gentleman think that the method adopted in the bill last year, which passed the House last year, is a better method of dealing with the matter than the one provided by this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I am frank to say I do not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why?

Mr. MADDEN. Under that bill there was no requirement whatever for the State that got the money to use it for building roads. It could put the money into its own treasury and pay any kind of obligation in the world with it that it wanted to pay. It need not use the money at all, and the only penalty for failing to use the money in the construction of roads was that it could not get the next annual apportionment, and of course that would be outrageous, unjustifiable. But this discretion left in the Secretary of Agriculture is not justifiable at all. There is another provision in this bill which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay installments on the roads under construction by the State, but the authority which we grant does not require him to investigate whether the road has really been built upon which he pays the installment; and of course that is not good business. It is not wise, it is not just, and it leads to danger.

The main objection I have to this bill is that it opens the door to political scandal; not to-day perhaps, not to-morrow, maybe not a year from now or 10 years from now; but we are entering upon a system of expenditures which will grow year by year. To-day we propose an expenditure of \$25,000,000. Now,

every man here knows that \$25,000,000 will not help to build many roads in all the States. You can not build a macadam road for less than \$10,000 a mile, and a State that gets \$300,000 or \$150,000 out of this appropriation will not be able to build many roads; but if we prove that we are entitled to the confidence of the American people by the manner in which we safeguard the expenditure of this money the sentiment of the people everywhere, from coast to coast and from the Lakes to the Gulf, will be in favor of increasing Federal cooperation as time goes by and we will be spending for Federal cooperation not \$25,000,000 a year but \$250,000,000 a year; and I know of no money that can be as well expended, that will yield as good results as the expenditure of money for the construction of roads, for it will bring to the people who live in the rural districts of the country more happiness and greater prosperity than they have ever enjoyed before. [Applause.] There are 60 per cent of the people, however, in America who do not live in the rural districts.

This bill provides that all cities of 2,000 population and under may become beneficiaries of the expenditures under this bill, but all people living in cities of 2,000 or over are excluded from its privileges. Sixty per cent of the American people live in cities having a population of over 2,000 people, so that this bill, although it will tax the whole 100,000,000 of people, will have benefited directly but 40,000,000 of the 100,000,000. We men who come from great cities do not complain at this, for we realize that the time is coming when we ought to discourage the centralization of population in the great cities of America and ought to do everything in our power that is just, right, and reasonable to encourage people to go back to the farms [applause], where the life of the citizenship is healthful and where a greater degree of patriotism may be fostered and preserved. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not true that a large per cent of the people in the cities will either be benefited or will use these highways when constructed?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; I am not complaining, and have not complained; and nothing I have said will justify any complaint on the part of any man, that I object to my contribution as a city resident for the development of the agricultural regions of the country, for I believe that the country is the safety valve of America; that there is the population upon which we must depend in time of stress, and I want to encourage every boy and girl of the coming generations to realize that on the farm, in the country, where God's sunshine prevails, and where men and women may grow to maturity without surrounding influences that are a detriment to American institutions—that there is the place we ought to spend our money for the development of that patriotism upon which we must depend in the years that are to come for the maintenance of our great institutions. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN rose.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, if he wishes to interrupt me.

Mr. SLOAN. In the gentleman's construction of this bill I understood him to say that cities of over 2,000 inhabitants were excluded from the benefits of this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. Perhaps I do not understand it correctly—

Mr. MADDEN. Up to 2,000 they have the privileges; above 2,000 they have not.

Mr. SLOAN. The bill says that rural post roads—

shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is, or might be, carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000, and in such cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart.

Which would be about 25 to the mile.

Now, then, is there anything in the statute that would prevent every dollar of the Illinois appropriation being used in improving or building post roads within the city of Chicago, beginning at its outside limit and running toward its center, if, in his discretion, the Secretary of Agriculture will say, "We will build up roads in the suburban portion of the city of Chicago and in that region where the residences are on an average of 200 feet apart"?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, you could not use a dollar of this money in a city of more than 2,000 people—not one dollar.

Mr. SLOAN. That is for construction by the House.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no question about it, absolutely. No dollar of this money could be used in any city for any improvement of any kind, on a post road or otherwise, of over 2,000 inhabitants, no matter whether the houses were 200 feet apart or 1,000 feet apart. But we are not complaining about that,

We people who come from the densely populated sections of America, as I have said, are willing to cooperate with all the other sections of America, because we believe we are doing the thing that is best for the people of America as a whole, and while we are not to be beneficiaries of this legislation, there is other legislation frequently enacted by the Congress that we do benefit from, whereas other sections of the United States do not benefit from them. So that in the long run the harbors of the great cities, the great buildings in the great cities, get their share of the public money for the development and maintenance of the public business, and we want every section of the Nation to feel that we are sufficiently patriotic to cooperate with them on any legislation that is bound in the long run to help America.

There is a feeling among the people all over the United States to-day that road building is the first and most important public activity in which the Government could be engaged. We are talking to-day a good deal about preparedness. But to be prepared to defend America's rights we must be able to move troops if we have them, and must have roads over which to move them. We are not going to be able to build these roads to-day and we are not going to require any troops to-day. And I hope that the day will never come when we will need to move troops to defend America's rights; but I do believe if the day ever comes we ought to be ready, and for one I am willing to do everything within my power to make every preparation to make us ready to defend our rights if they need to be defended [applause], whether it is by building good roads, buying harness, buying mules, cultivating fields; whether it is building large guns or defending the coast line, building battleships, maintaining armies, or any other thing that patriotic America believes ought to be done, not only to maintain America's present prestige but to be able to stand before the world with notice to everybody everywhere that we are not only ready now, but we will be ready always to defend America's institutions and hand down this Government unsullied to the generations that are to people this continent in the ages to come. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask at this time leave to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate this privilege and opportunity to address you upon the subject of Federal aid to good roads. I approach it modestly, not with the expectation of particularly enlarging your knowledge but with the hope that I may at least recall some things you have heretofore heard and emphasize some thoughts which may have been distinctly your own. The problem now before us is not a new one. It antedates many centuries, and has descended to us a heritage of ancient philosophy rather than a principle of recent deduction. It first appeared in our country as soon as affairs had adjusted themselves after the securing of our independence, and from 1802 until the present time nearly every Congress has had before it some phase of this subject, and during that entire period we have had a semblance of Federal aid to highway construction.

I was very much interested in and thoroughly enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who presented opposition views to the passage of this measure. It seemed to me that his grounds were ill founded, and in the presentation of his opposition he very aptly illustrated his theory that under the provision of this bill roads would start from nowhere and go elsewhere. He deprecates the fact that some of the States will not be able to come within the purview of its provisions. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that his statement is without foundation and that in truth every State may enjoy the privilege of this bill without the trouble, the legal complications, and constitutional objections prevalent in bills upon the same subject heretofore presented to Congress. I do not think any bill has ever been presented which so completely covers the problem as does this. The gentleman from Massachusetts opposes the measure before us primarily, as he says, because in his State and in many of the Eastern States they already have completed their road systems. The gentleman is ill informed not only as to the other States but even with regard to his own State. Road systems are never completed, sir, in any sense of the word. I will concede that some of your Eastern States have made an excellent start and laid a splendid foundation, but only the gentleman's satisfied imagination supports his contention. Right to-day, upon the statute books of your State, there is a provision which requires

all the revenues derived from automobile taxes, automobile licenses, and from fines, aggregating approximately \$1,000,000 annually, to go into your good-roads fund. Only a year ago the gentleman's State legislature, under the provisions of law in his State, issued bonds to the amount of \$2,000,000 for the good-roads system there. And so regardless of the modest enthusiasm of the gentleman concerning the roads in his State, there seem to be fair indications of opportunities still to improve the road system of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

The gentleman also insists that Federal aid in the construction of good roads is a plank in the Democratic platform and for that reason should not have the support of the Republicans on this side of the House. If the gentleman has discovered one plank in the Democratic platform which that party is endeavoring to fulfill, his efforts are not without value, but as an excuse for any opposition to this measure his statement is decidedly puerile. The truth of the matter is that this is not in any sense a party measure, neither is the bill an exclusive product of Democratic brains. The time has long passed when either side must accept or reject remedial legislation simply because it is fluently labeled with any party's appellation. [Applause.]

The magnitude and importance of the subject must fairly be conceded by its opponents. The Sixty-third Congress appointed a joint committee to consider the feasibility of Federal aid to good roads. That committee has made a most exhaustive and comprehensive report, which I trust will be read by everyone interested in this project. The personnel of the committee insures the authenticity and value of their statements. Permit me to read a few extracts from this report:

From an economic standpoint the problem of good roads is not surpassed in importance by any other subject now before the American people. Experience has demonstrated that past methods are inadequate to accomplish desired results and the demand for Federal aid has become general and insistent. Viewed from the standpoint of financial returns alone, if the American people borrowed \$8,400,000,000 at 6 per cent interest and invested it in permanent road improvements they would come out more than even and also enjoy the personal, social, and educational advantages of the good roads. Although the burden of national participation in highway improvement would fall most heavily upon city residents, yet inhabitants of cities have been among the most active advocates of Federal participation in highway construction and maintenance. Public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of Federal aid. Replies representing 100,000 individuals came from every State in the Union, and, since the requests for opinions were made without discrimination and the answers received were from all parts of the United States, the responses show, with reasonable accuracy, the consensus of public opinion on the subjects mentioned. Ninety-seven per cent of the replies received favored Federal aid and 3 per cent were against it.

One of the members of this joint committee was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who just addressed you so ably in opposition to the passage of this bill. I must confess that having heretofore read the favorable report, signed by the gentleman himself, his remarks to-day were somewhat surprising to me. Of course, having been a Member of this Congress for only 50 days, I realize that I have not yet enjoyed all of the surprises which await me. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman in a minute.

Mr. MADDEN. Did I not say that in my speech?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Yes; the gentleman interrupts me to ask if he did not say that in his speech. He did, and he ought properly to have added this: "I am in favor of aid to good roads, but I know of no man on earth, including myself, who is able to draft a bill which will meet with my approbation." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Very gladly.

Mr. MADDEN. Did I say in my speech anything that was contrary to what the gentleman read?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. No.

Mr. MADDEN. That is part of my own report.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. That is true. But, Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the gentleman, whose superior knowledge I grant, I contend that he is now very much in the position of the woman who wished to buy eggs; she knew little of their character, but remembered that good eggs when immersed in water either stayed on top or went to the bottom, but upon reaching the market place she had forgotten which. [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY. The objection of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] seems to start with line 14 of page 4, which limits the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to the

amount of aid given to any particular improvement which might, as the gentleman from Illinois says, lead to favoritism in the various States. Will my colleague state the reasons which led the committee to allow the Secretary of Agriculture that discretion?

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I shall be glad to give the gentleman my judgment.

If we are to have Federal aid in the construction of our public highways there must be a comity between the several States and the Nation. In this bill the State is represented by the State highway department, if they have one, and by an appointee of the governor in the very few States who have not now a State highway department; the Government is represented by the Secretary of Agriculture. It appealed to the committee that the several State highway departments were best fitted and best able to represent the State, and that they were most responsive and subject to the will and wish of the people in the State. We deemed it inadvisable to make the present unit smaller than the State lest it might argumentatively be open to the pork-barrel criticism directed against former bills upon this same subject. In so far as the Nation is concerned the committee thought the Department of Agriculture was best equipped and fitted to care for the Government's interests. This is right along their line of work. The War Department now recommends, superintends, and accepts the improvements made under the Federal aid to the waterways. If this assignment is proper, and it has been in vogue these many years, certainly the Department of Agriculture could properly be charged with the discretion conferred under the terms of this bill.

In order to defraud the Government under the terms of this bill, it would be necessary for two things to exist concurrently. Those are a corrupt State highway department and a corrupt Secretary of Agriculture, and in that connection permit me to say that as long as departments in this, or any other Government, are supervised by human beings that possibility will always exist; but I am not yet ready to reject a good measure simply because under its provisions it allows the exercise of discretion on the part of State and Government officials. With the eyes of the entire country directed on one or two persons, I think it much easier to keep them honest and faithful than it would be if this discretion were delegated to a larger number of people. I can not conceive of any man being appointed Secretary of Agriculture by the President of the United States who would be so small, parsimonious, and unworthy of his honorable appointment as to evince favoritism in the disposition of the Federal aid funds. Under the terms of this bill, he could not give any part of a State's apportionment to another State; in fact, the worst he could do would be to allow one State its entire quota and disallow another State its entire quota; but, sir, the question now presents itself if that is not a wise provision. Some States will so demean themselves that they should properly receive their entire quota while other States may try to secure their share without having fulfilled their obligations under the terms of this measure; and if there was a mandatory instead of a discretionary provision herein contained, it would be more liable to abuse than is the present bill. If we concede to others the same honesty and integrity of purpose which we claim for ourselves, the workable flexibility of this bill becomes its greatest asset rather than a proof of its inefficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Scott] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. This joint committee to which I referred obtained authentic information from all the foreign countries as to their road conditions over there. In that connection permit me to say that that report shows facts which are worthy of the consideration of every Member of this House, and I trust every Member will read it. It shows that every foreign country, with the exception of Russia, has anywhere from one and one-half to three and one-quarter times the road mileage per square mile than has the United States, yet we claim to be a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, while those foreign countries are simply overshadowing us in their accomplishments in so far as good roads are concerned. Why, gentlemen, I desire to call your attention to the fact that 300 years before Christ Appius Claudius built a road from Rome to Naples which is better to-day than the road from here to Annapolis or the road from here to Richmond; still we claim to be the most progressive of all nations.

During the past century this country has spent millions, yea billions, upon our public waterways. I do not deprecate that

expenditure. In fact, I am in favor of it. Yet upon this floor only a few days ago a gentleman arose and said that at least one-half of that expenditure had been wasted. I rather doubt that statement; but even if it is true, what does it prove? It only proves that Congresses heretofore and this Congress and future Congresses, if they permit the waste, are at fault. It certainly does not by innuendo, inference, or otherwise prove the iniquity of the purpose.

Our attention is challenged to the fact that the Federal aid to the waterways is a contribution to a Government service over which the Government never loses control. That sounds well, but, analyzed, it means only this: In so far as the waterways are concerned the Government maintains the semblance of police authority for the enforcement of rules laid down by the Government; and they also establish protective stations to safeguard the lives and property upon this avenue of commerce. Nothing more can be claimed. I am glad that our waterways have had the care and attention of this Government; but in behalf of the 50,000,000 people who do not see or use the waterways I ask you why this Government should longer continue to discriminate as to our great highways of commerce. Until very recently the general road system of this country was a system of tolerance. It was one whose origin was almost legendary; one which we had copied from Great Britain, and to which we have tenaciously held, although it was discarded by our mother country over a century ago. We may differ on many phases of the Government's management, but in the effort to secure good roads we certainly can find a common ground free from party lines or political dissension.

A committee, whose membership represents the two great political parties of this country, have, with but a single dissenting voice, presented this bill for your favorable consideration. We do not contend that it is the best measure of accomplishment, but we do insist that it is a step in the right direction, based not upon fancy or idle theory but founded upon a system which, if properly followed and extended, must inevitably bring greater returns than any expenditure heretofore made by this Government. Ninety-seven per cent of all the people living within the confines of these United States favor Federal aid in the construction and maintenance of public highways.

The rural districts ought not to be compelled to do a work in which the whole people are in every way interested and in the reward wherefrom the rural resident is the lesser participant. In the bill before you we have made what we consider a fair apportionment of the funds. We have allowed the several State highway departments to continue their activities along their own particular lines, to which it must necessarily be conceded they are best advised, and certainly the magnificent highways of California, the Columbia River Road, and the beautiful highways in our Central and Eastern States must convince any doubtful hearer or student of the subject that the several States, under the terms of this bill, are well able to care for the task assigned. It is neither commendable nor logical for people who have enjoyed good roads these many years to oppose a plan which would make their enjoyment a possibility for our less fortunate citizens and countrymen. In ancient days the empire's resources were taxed to build great imperial highways, so that its armies might reach distant provinces to quell insurrections or collect tribute. To-day roads are not built for pillage or conquest, and we hope not for the needs of war, but these great highways are primarily constructed for civilization and trade. They are the avenues of uplift in our social, intellectual, and religious life. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I shall consume the time allotted to me in endeavoring to answer some of the criticisms leveled at this bill by my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to impose on the gentleman from South Carolina, but I think I voted twice for a good roads bill in the House. I know I voted for one in the last Congress and I think I did in the one before that. The other two bills, I think, were alike. This bill is entirely different. Nobody has yet explained the difference or why the committee have changed their attitude. I hope that at some time somebody on the committee will do us the honor of telling us what caused the flop.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will answer the gentleman from Illinois. The fact is that the bill in the last Congress was not the same as the bill in the Sixty-second Congress. If my recollection is correct, the gentleman from Illinois voted against the amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill in the Sixty-second Congress, though I am not certain.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's recollection is not good.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know the gentleman from Illinois in the last Congress voted for the bill and made a short speech in favor of it. That bill, however, was not the same as the bill in the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. MANN. Practically the same.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can explain the difference to the gentleman. In the Sixty-second Congress the proposition submitted as an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill was the proposed classification of the roads into A, B, and C, with a provision for the payment of a rental of so much per mile for class A, so much for class B, and so much for class C, provided it should be proved first that the State had during the preceding year spent a like amount on those roads.

In the Sixty-third Congress there was a bill introduced—I am familiar with it, because I introduced the bill—and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] likewise introduced a bill which was almost identical with the provisions of this bill. That bill was made section 2, and then the classification of roads—the rental proposition, as it was called by some—was made section 3, and there was another section giving to a State the alternative of electing under which section of that bill it would receive Federal aid. That was the bill in the last Congress.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] knows, both those bills met with strong opposition in the Senate. First proposed as an amendment to the Post Office bill, it was voted down, and finally we had an experimental appropriation of \$500,000 added in conference. Then in the last Congress the bill passed this House, but was never even reported from the Senate committee. I know that it met with strong opposition in the Post Office Committee of the Senate, and there was no chance for its passage in the Senate.

This year the American Association of Highway Engineers met and appointed a committee to draft a bill providing for Federal aid. That bill is almost identical with the provisions of the bill now reported by the Roads Committee. When it was presented to the committee, we believed that it eliminated all of the features that had been objected to in the Senate, and in addition eliminated the feature that has met with the strongest opposition in this House, where it was charged that the proposition to pay a rental for the roads over which the rural carriers traveled would not demand of the States that the money be spent for the improvement of roads, and that there would not be that Federal supervision which is necessary to safeguard appropriations out of the Federal Treasury.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] was one of those who, with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], were particularly strong in their opposition to the classification road proposition. I heard the gentleman from Missouri say the other day that because that feature was eliminated he is now in favor of this bill. We were not so fortunate, however, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], because, although he stated in the Sixty-third Congress that he was in favor of Federal aid and limited his opposition to that proposition providing for the rental, now, when we come to this Congress, he objects to a bill that is drawn in strict accord with the principles laid down by him in his speech, for he then said that he would favor Federal aid in cooperation with the States, provided that the States were required to spend the same amount before the Federal Government was called upon to spend anything.

The Association of Highway Engineers, composed of engineers from every State in the Union, are in favor of this bill. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, too, that the Secretary of Agriculture is in favor of this proposition, and that the Director of the Office of Public Roads is in favor of this proposition, while both of them were opposed to the rental proposition that was in the last bill; and as we desired to report a bill that would stand some chance of becoming a law we eliminated the rental proposition. Having given it two trials we thought we were justified in making the change.

The rental proposition having been eliminated, the gentleman from Illinois now finds a new reason for opposing this bill. He says the Secretary of Agriculture is given too much discretion. He believes it would open the door for a Member of the House or of the Senate to influence the Secretary of Agriculture. If he really believes that, he would also object to the provision that before any amount is paid the Secretary of Agriculture should inspect the road to see whether it has been finished

in accordance with the plans and specifications. He wishes us to believe that if a Member of the Senate or the House should go to the Secretary of Agriculture and say "It is true, Mr. Secretary, the road is not completed in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted and approved by you, but to please me I want you to approve of it and pay over this money," the Secretary would do it. If we are to believe that a member of the Cabinet, the Secretary of Agriculture, is going to use his office to please a Member of the House or the Senate and allow to a road a greater per cent than he should we may as well believe that under similar circumstances he would approve a road that does not come up to the specifications. We must place confidence in some official to administer the law, and I know of no reason why we should not assume that the Secretary will administer the law in the spirit in which it is framed.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman has covered the ground, but I am not sure. My recollection was that in the Sixty-second Congress we provided in the bill for the payment of \$15, \$20, or \$30 a mile, which you call the rental proposition.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MANN. In the Sixty-third Congress we provided the same thing with an alternative about paying money to States. This bill leaves out the matter that was put in in the Sixty-second Congress entirely, or the particular methods we had in the Sixty-third Congress, and adopts to a large extent the alternative in the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is exactly right. The alternative proposition in the Sixty-third Congress is substantially the bill pending before the House. As a result of our experience in that Congress and of our more careful consideration we have thrown a number of safeguards around it and made it a much better bill than the alternative proposition in the last House.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says that we ought to put double the amount which the States should pay. In several speeches during the last two Congresses he has never suggested that the States should be required to contribute twice the amount until to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not mean that the State shall contribute twice the amount. I said the State should spend twice the amount placed to its credit before the Federal Government paid.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The criticism of the gentleman from Illinois was leveled at the discretionary power of the Secretary of Agriculture to contribute to any proposition from 30 to 50 per cent. I will tell the gentleman the reason the committee inserted that. In many States of the Union there is a considerable State road fund; while in some States the funds for road purposes are very limited. In the State of Illinois, for instance, you may have a road fund so large that you would rather have the Government contribute to the aid of a great number of roads with 30 per cent than to have it contribute to a few roads and pay 50 per cent. The gentleman overlooks the fact that no matter whether the Secretary of Agriculture allots the roads 30 per cent of the proposed cost or 50 per cent of the proposed cost, the State is entitled to its full quota under the bill.

If the Secretary of Agriculture says, in response to a given proposition, "I will allot you 30 per cent," it simply means that that State can receive aid on a greater number of roads than could a State which received from the Government 50 per cent. It was inserted because some wealthier States would prefer to have the Government contribute only 30 per cent to a great number of roads, whereas some States having only a few hundred thousand dollars to spend would prefer to have the Government contribute on a 50 per cent basis. But, in any event, whether it is 30 per cent or 50 per cent, the Secretary of Agriculture does not have the discretion or power to take away from the State the apportionment that it is entitled to under the basis of apportionment in this bill.

But the gentleman from Massachusetts, in his minority report, stated as to the basis of apportionment that if this is to aid the rural community the appropriation should be based on the ratio that the rural population bears to the population of the entire country. He does not believe that, I am satisfied. I think it was an oversight on his part when he inserted it in the minority report, because the provision in the bill which gives to a State credit for having within its borders a city with such a large population as Boston has results in the State of Massachusetts, from which the gentleman comes, getting a

larger amount than it would receive if its quota was based merely on the rural population of the State of Massachusetts. But he answered his own argument when in his speech he took the position not that the State of Massachusetts is allotted too much but it is allotted too small an amount when you consider the amount of taxes that the State of Massachusetts contributes to the Federal Treasury. I think he stated that last year the States of Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio paid \$31,140,000 of the total amount of the so-called war tax of \$52,000,000. Of the States he enumerated I took the trouble to add up their allotment under this bill and I find they receive \$8,363,750 by this bill; but that is no argument for or against the bill. The Congress can not adopt the policy of making no appropriation for any purpose in a State until it is ascertained that the proposed appropriation will not amount to more than the amount contributed by that State to the Federal Treasury. The gentleman would not favor applying that narrow policy to State appropriations. Suppose, for instance, the city of Boston, which city because of its wealth contributes in great measure to the taxable funds of Massachusetts, should say to the legislature of that State that public funds in proportion to the amount of taxes paid by the city should be spent in internal improvements in that city, the gentleman from Massachusetts, in behalf of his section of that State, would immediately complain.

It is too narrow a view. The people of the city of Boston know that their prosperity is dependent upon the country. Last summer I went to New Hampshire, and every time I attempted to cross the street in the little city of Bethlehem I was kept busy dodging automobiles bearing a license tag of Massachusetts. They do not contribute to maintaining the roads of New Hampshire, but New Hampshire, on the other hand, through its tourist hotels, does contribute to the prosperity of the city of Boston, because they buy all of their supplies there; and I am satisfied that if he would submit the proposition to the merchants of the city of Boston he would find that they were in favor of contributing toward building roads in New Hampshire and in all other sections, out of the National Treasury, in order that the country might be developed and thereby the city of Boston be developed. The road problem is no longer a local problem. The increased use of automobiles has resulted in the roads being used by persons residing in different counties and different States who do not contribute to their maintenance at all, and it is not fair to expect the entire cost of construction and maintenance to be borne by the adjoining landowner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in like manner the gentleman complained that in New York State they had built their roads, that that State already had a magnificent system of roads. That is true. He said that, having completed those roads, they should not be called upon to contribute to the construction of roads in the West and in the South. But a few minutes thereafter I heard the gentleman ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] if it were not true that last year the State of New York expended \$14,000,000 in the construction of roads. If he is correct, then it would appear that New York has not completed all of its construction work, and that a great part of that \$14,000,000 expenditure last year could have been expended in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture through the Secretary, had this bill been a law. Another argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], which was agreed to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], is that this bill would result in discouraging road building on the part of the States. But there is absolutely no justification for such an argument, the bill specifically providing that no appropriation can be made by the Secretary of Agriculture until the work has been completed by the State in accordance with the plans and specifications approved by him, or in case of partial payment, that in no case shall a dollar be paid unless the State has already paid a like sum in that construction work, and in any event the discretion is always placed in the Secretary of Agriculture, and instead of making a partial payment he need not make any payment unless he is satisfied that that work is done in accordance with the plans and specifications approved by him.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Evidently a great deal of money will be necessary to pay the expenses in Washington and the expenses of men to go over the country to inspect these roads. Is any part of that expense to be paid out of the allotment to the

State, or is it to be paid out of the amount to be retained by the Secretary for the expense of management?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, my recollection of the terms of the bill is that they provide that it shall be deducted out of the fund by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What fund?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Out of the gross appropriation; out of the total fund.

Mr. MANN. Section 3 makes provision.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will read the gentleman the language of the bill:

That as soon as may be after the passage of any act making appropriations under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount of such appropriation he has set apart to defray the expense of his department in the administration of this act.

And he shall then certify to the States the amount of the balance available to each State.

Mr. SAUNDERS. And also in section 2 there is a provision that out of the general appropriation the Secretary reserves a fund sufficient to cover these expenses.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this is one bill that has never been discussed in a partisan manner in this House. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] the other day—I suppose for the purpose of influencing those on the Republican side of the House—said that the members of the Republican Party should not be anxious to assist the Democratic Party in redeeming one of its campaign pledges. The truth is that the Progressive Party in its platform unequivocally declared in favor of Federal aid, and the truth is that in the past not only has the leader of the Republicans, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] voted for this bill, but the great majority of Republicans on this bill have voted in favor of it, so that in no way can it be considered a partisan measure.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman have any idea that the Democrats in this Congress will carry out the pledge in their platform on this subject?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the belief of the gentleman is that the Democrats in this House will do it, but I would not undertake to speak for the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. MANN. It would be so unusual for the Democrats to carry out any plank of their platform that I do not believe they will.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about another objection that has been raised to this bill. I refer to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that this bill forces a State to establish a highway department, whether it desires to or not. It is true that this bill will force every State by 1920 to establish a highway department, but I do not think he ought to entertain any worry because of that provision, for his State has one. If there is anyone who ought to complain about that, it ought to be the gentlemen from Indiana, from Texas, from the State of Georgia, from the State of Mississippi, and from my own State of South Carolina, because those five States are the only States that have no highway departments. I must say that I do not complain, because from my study of the subject I know it would be practically impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with every county and township in the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman states that he has no highway department in his State. Does not this bill provide that the State shall share in the benefits just as much as though it did have a highway department?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Only until 1920; and by 1920 they must have a highway department.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is paid by the Government to an official of the State government designated by the governor until 1920.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Until 1920.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If you do not want it by that time, send it up to Michigan.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Under the bill South Carolina is entitled to \$415,000 a year, and there is no danger of our not placing ourselves in position to secure it. I want to say this provision has been made allowing them until 1920 so that

in case the legislature of any one of these States shall not convene for one year or two years that they will have ample time within which to place the State in a position to participate in this fund. As far as my own State is concerned, whether or not this bill becomes a law, I think it will be to the best interests of the State to have a highway department; but, even if I am wrong, certainly it is true if we are to have any Federal aid we could not expect the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the various townships. In some of the States the road work is in the control of township commissioners, and there are 30,000 townships in the United States of America and over 3,500 counties. It will be impossible to open up a set of books and keep accounts with all of those counties and all of those townships. Why, the bookkeeping expense would amount to so much that very little of this fund would ever reach the roads where it is most needed.

Again, how would the Secretary of Agriculture decide in which county or which township the road would be built? His lack of knowledge of the local conditions would preclude his doing that in an intelligent manner, and therefore we say that Congress should treat with each State as a sovereign State and give to that State through its highway department the power to say where that money should be spent and to propose a specific proposition to the Secretary of Agriculture for his approval. The work can then be done under the laws of the State, and jurisdiction over the roads remains with the State.

If in the discharge of their duties under the bill the State highway department officials are arbitrary, the people of that State can remedy it by getting rid of those officials at the next election. I believe that the effect will be that each of the five States without a highway department now will establish one within the next few years and place themselves in a position to participate. Another reason why it would not be practicable is that in some States, South Carolina for instance, the work is done by counties. I know that is also true of Georgia, Mississippi, and, I think, Indiana, and very few counties are able to employ road engineers. This bill provides that a proposition submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture shall have surveys, plans, and specifications. No township or county without a road engineer could ever submit to the Secretary of Agriculture plans and specifications and surveys in such a manner as would receive his approval, so it will necessitate the appointment of a highway department, with the employment of engineers who can assist the county and local township officials in the preparation of propositions to be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not intend to discuss the value of good roads, because every sane man realizes their value. I have for years hoped that a bill providing Federal aid could be passed here. In the Sixty-second Congress I found that there were more than 20 bills on the subject introduced, and as up to that time no bill had been reported by a committee of the House I concluded that by individual effort nothing could be accomplished. I therefore invited every Member who had introduced a bill on the subject to meet at my office. Nearly every one attended a meeting at which, acting as chairman, I appointed a committee of which the chairman of the Roads Committee, Mr. SHACKLEFORD, was made chairman; and this subcommittee drafted a bill which was afterwards agreed upon by us and introduced, and later was considered in the House as an amendment to the Post Office bill. I realized then, as I do now, that no man can hope to secure the passage of a bill on this subject the provisions of which are exclusively the product of his brain. All legislation is enacted as a result of compromises, and while this bill may not be what I would have it, if given power to write a bill, I believe it is more likely to pass this Congress than any other measure, and at the same time its provisions insure, if it shall become law, that an advanced step will be taken toward securing the construction of permanent roads that will not be open to the charge of starting nowhere and running elsewhere.

I wish to express the hope that, disregarding the expressed desire of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that this measure be considered as a partisan measure, the Republican Members of the House will join with the Democratic Members in placing upon the statute books this law, which will do more to promote the prosperity and the happiness of the people of the country as a whole than any other measure pending before this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who opposed the so-called good-roads bill in the Sixty-third Congress, and it would not serve any profitable purpose at this time to review the argument that I made at that time. It is sufficient to say that the present bill is, in my judgment, a very much better bill and a very much more practical bill than anything

that has been presented to this House on the subject of Federal aid for roads. I have been a persistent advocate of Federal aid for good roads, and my advocacy has been on the ground not that the Federal Government was under any obligation to assume any portion of the activities or burdens or responsibilities now discharged by the local authorities in regard to roads, but rather to supplement and augment them and provide for a general improvement in all forms of roads.

I believe that is possible under the present bill and that an opening is made for Federal aid which will encourage the building of modern roads. I have no apology to make for having persistently advocated a higher type of road, the so-called permanent roads or modern roads, as against the mere expenditure of Federal money for the temporary upkeep of unimproved roads. I would not advocate a bill which would require or compel the expenditure of Federal money for the temporary upkeep of the ordinary unimproved roads. Such a bill, I believe, might be open to all the objections which have been urged against Federal road bills; that they would discourage local enterprise; that they would result in constantly increasing demands upon the Federal Treasury without an increasing response or cooperation by the States; and that they might not result in any distinct improvement in our present system of roads. The pending bill will permit, and I believe, encourage the building of modern highways. I am a believer in the principle of Federal aid and I listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is on the Roads Committee, and to his objections to Federal aid. His argument was that some of the States of this Union have a very large taxing power and are able to and do provide themselves with a modern system of roads, and therefore all the States can do equally well. I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts upon the increasing wealth of his State. He has every reason to be proud of it. But I desire to remind the gentleman that all of that wealth which demands and receives the protection of the Federal Government was not originated or produced in the State of Massachusetts. It is the centralized wealth of the Nation. I know that objection from the same source was made to opening the western territory, even to the acquisition of the Louisiana Purchase at the very beginning of our national history, that it might in some degree discriminate against the older States, and yet the very reverse has been the case.

The older States have grown in wealth and population and culture and refinement as the newer States have come in and added their quota of the general prosperity of the Nation. I believe that the same result will follow from the development of roads throughout the country. I might say to the gentleman that under this bill, which gives the States the initiative and permits them to expend the money upon a system of roads or a particular trunk-line road or certain individual roads, I do not know whether my State will devote immediately or in the very near future any portion of the fund coming to it to the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, because it so chances we have in that congressional district more improved roads to-day than in any other district in the State of Missouri. We have in the single county of Jackson over 300 miles of macadamized and oiled roads. But I support the bill because it will aid in developing every part of Missouri. My objection to the bill in the last Congress was that it was based not upon the necessity for roads but upon the question of the accumulation of taxing power in the districts where the roads existed.

It will help the committee to understand my point of view to say that that lies at the base of my whole idea on the subject of Federal aid to roads. Very frequently the districts which have the greatest need for roads and where the improvement of roads would be the most productive of benefit to the entire State and country have the least local taxing power to perform the responsibility. When I began to study the subject of roads I had an idea that a good road could be built and maintained by the adjoining landowners at their own expense, as streets are now constructed in the cities, but when I came to analyze that proposition I found to my surprise that it did not apply to rural highways.

The reason was this: City property is valuable solely for the purpose of location or accessibility, and which has no limit of value if it be well located and have the modern improvements. A farm is valuable for its power of production. Other incidents enter in, but that is the main value. The wealth that is produced on the farm can not stay on the farm. Before it becomes wealth it finds its way into the great distributing centers of the country. But the minute it leaves the farm and finds its way into the great distributing centers of the country, it to that extent reduces the taxing power of the local district where the

wealth was produced, and it never returns for the purposes of taxation to that local district. Yet we have the entire Nation basing its prosperity upon the prosperity of the farms, annually drawing from the farms the taxable wealth and concentrating it in the cities and great distributing centers, never returning that wealth to the farms and communities, and leaving upon those communities the entire burden and responsibility of keeping up the facilities which produce that wealth. For that reason we have been upon a false basis.

There has never been any one thing which has so militated against good roads in this country as the plan of isolated local control over roads. Our road district is the smallest political subdivision that we have, and that small political subdivision is supposed to take care to the best of its ability of the particular sections of roads that are in that political subdivision. The result is that some small divisions have magnificent roads; some States have magnificent roads, and other States, with large mileage and scattered population and immense needs for immediate development, have a burden which they are unable immediately to assume. This is true of the State of Missouri. Our business men recognize that the wealth that is now centered in Kansas City and St. Louis was not produced in Kansas City and St. Louis, but is a part of the accumulated wealth of the State of Missouri.

The wealth which is now centered in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore was not produced in those cities, but is a part of the centralized wealth of the entire American Nation. It demands the protection of the entire country on all Federal subjects, and it receives it. It demands it on the question of other transportation, rivers and harbors, and properly so, and there is no reason why it should not respond, on the same principle, when it comes to the improvement of rural roads, which are as much a vital part of our prosperity as the improvement of the rivers and harbors or any other part of our national activity. [Applause.]

If the transportation across the Alleghenies were severed for 30 days, New York and Boston, with all their boasted prosperity, would be on the verge of starvation. There would be no possibility of feeding the great population of those centers without the immediate facilities for transportation from the West.

It is the isolated system of local control of roads which has militated against a general improvement of the highways. We borrowed that system from England, as we did most of our common law, but we borrowed it at a time when England was a hermit nation, with her forests full of outlaws and 95 per cent of her young men going to the Continent for an education. We have adapted it to a country 3,000 miles in extent, under necessity for immediate development, with a sparsely settled population and at a time when England and every other nation of the world have abandoned a system of local, isolated control of roads. Every man knows who has given the subject any study that all of the other civilized countries of the world have a national system of roads, supplemented by provincial and local roads. I do not think the time is far distant when in this country, by the cooperation of the State and Nation, with the local authorities cooperating with the State, we will have a system of interstate highways as wide and as great in its ramifications as the present system of railroads, and as useful.

I know that we have had to weather a storm of abuse and considerable ridicule in advocating a system of high-grade, improved highways, and yet even the experience of two years since this bill was before the House has demonstrated the growing strength of that sentiment. There was formed a few days ago in a central Missouri city an association of permanent road associations. These road associations believe in through roads—a system of roads, permanent roads, all-the-year-around roads. The sentiment is growing in every State of the Union, and particularly in the State of Missouri. Every business man in every small town in the State of Missouri to-day, almost without exception, belongs to some road-improvement association designed to connect the roads of his town with the great centers of the State and with interstate traffic. The present sentiment in favor of good roads was largely created and is fostered by these road associations, who are working in the interest of high-grade interstate highways. Although I have been ridiculed and abused for supporting this business sentiment on the floor of Congress, I have no apology to make when I see Congress coming to our view. What the farmers and business men want is roads, not politics. As the business men have awakened to the need of a system of permanent roads, the ideas of Congress have changed to conform to the advancement of public opinion.

That is the present tendency of the times. To my mind it accounts for the great improvement in this legislation which we

now have before the House to-day over that which was offered to us two years ago. We have not given all the attention to this subject that we could. We certainly did not know a great deal about it when we started in to legislate upon it. The public has also educated itself considerably on the subject, and we are getting nearer to a working system now than ever before.

We believe we ought not to confine our aid to local roads, and ought not to confine it to post roads, or confine it to mere rental of roads. We have the right under the construction of the Federal Constitution to provide for commercial roads, roads carrying interstate traffic.

When the building of the Panama Canal was proposed some gentleman brought a suit against Leslie M. Shaw, then Secretary of the Treasury, to restrain him from paying out any money for the construction of the canal, on the ground that the Constitution gave to Congress no power to construct such a canal; but Judge Brewer, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court, said the Constitution was as clear in investing the Congress with the power to authorize the construction of a canal for interstate commerce as in the power to authorize the construction of a road, and that the latter proposition was now clearly settled in the jurisprudence of the United States.

What is interstate commerce? When does it begin and when does it end? We all recognize the fact that the free interchange of commodities is the greatest method of disseminating and diffusing wealth. The largest amount of interstate commerce begins its journey to the market on the rural roads; all of the supply of the food products of the country and much of the great raw material which enters into manufactures and forms the great bulk of our exports and turns the balance of trade in our favor begins its course to the markets on the rural roads. We believe that the great harbor of New York is an agency of interstate commerce. We know that when a ship sails out of that harbor carrying a cargo of American wheat abroad it is engaged in interstate commerce; but I believe that the minute the farmer turns on a public road with a load of wheat on its way to market, that wheat has as certainly entered the commerce of the world as when the ship clears the lights of Sandy Hook and starts on its way to Europe. We can not differentiate between them. That wheat is just as certainly on its way to the great commerce of the world when it started on the first road to the market town as when it started on its voyage across the ocean.

We must begin at the beginning, at the very base, to build up the prosperity of the country. But, in addition to the commercial argument, the social and intellectual conditions of the rural sections all invite at this time the serious attention of Congress to the subject of good roads. Not only does the taxable wealth leave the country districts but the working power of the community also leaves the country districts. What is it that has made farm life open to the charge of loneliness and isolation? That charge has been largely removed by the rural free delivery and the telephone and the daily delivery of mail. The next great step toward the socialization of farm life is the rural highway. [Applause.] The rural highway will build up the local church. It will build up the local school. It will build up the local town and trading point. It will turn the stream of life and travel and commercial wealth back into the country districts from which they originally came. It is the only tendency of modern life that will have that effect. All other tendencies of modern life have been to put a blight upon country life and small town life. The great railroads, the great department stores, the great mail-order houses, and all of the distribution of wealth and capital have tended to sap the life-blood of the smaller communities and leave them nothing upon which to build. But the good roads, enabling the farmer to haul his products 365 days in the year, enabling him to get to the market town, enabling him to go to the country church, enabling his children to get to school, enabling his neighbors and relatives to visit, to come in and sup with him, will bring back the social life to the community.

What is it that brings the young people trooping into the cities? What is it that they see or think they see under the bright lights of the cities? Is it the opportunity for the indulgence of vice? No man who knows the young people of the country believes any such statement. They see, or think they see, under the glittering bright lights of the cities the opportunities for social and intellectual stimulus which the young people need; in short, the things which these good roads, with the interchange of social life, will encourage. If the social opportunities and opportunities for intellectual advancement could be had in the rural communities, the young people would be content to stay on the farms and in the small towns, whereas

they are now flocking to the cities. We are able to comprehend at this time the effect that a general system of good roads will have on the general social life of the community.

I know that in most of the States, and particularly in the Middle Western States, the cities and urban population have grown at the expense largely of the rural population. The rural population in many places has fallen off, while the city population has gained. We can talk all we choose about the back-to-the-farm movement and how independent the farmer is, but until we are willing to provide a general system of good roads by a general system of taxation, reaching all the wealth of the State and Nation, and giving an equal opportunity to the man who stays on the farm and in the small town with the man who goes to the city, we talk in vain. We must let him know that he is to have an equal opportunity for the development of his section with those in the cities, and in order to do that we must lay our hand upon the accumulated wealth of the Nation, whether it be on farms or in the cities, for objects like improved roads, which are for the general good of the whole community.

Now, it may be true that some portion of the taxes collected in one part of the country will be expended under this plan in another part. I have no doubt that a great deal of the tax collected in Kansas City and St. Louis is expended throughout the State of Missouri under the system of State taxation, and a great deal of the wealth of Massachusetts will be expended in the rural States from which that wealth originally came. Yet that will not prove a disadvantage to those great wealth-concentrating centers. Does that mean that there is an unequal distribution of the burdens of taxation and government? Not necessarily so, because if the business men of the cities are wise they will recognize, as I think my constituents do, that their wealth originally came from the country districts, and that the improvement of the country districts will indirectly improve the cities.

This principle is recognized universally by the States. The State of Missouri with its great cities of St. Louis and Kansas City, and the State of Illinois with its great city of Chicago, taxes the whole property of the State for the improvement of roads and for other general State purposes. The improvement of the roads of Missouri, Montana, and the Dakotas is just as much a charge on the accumulated wealth now centered in New York, Philadelphia, or any large city. There is no injustice done to any section of the country. The main question before the people is whether the benefit is general, whether it be national in its character, whether it is so widely diffused and comes so fully under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution as to be a proper subject of national legislation. I believe it does.

Nor have I any complaint in regard to the control to be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture over the expenditure of this road money. As members of the committee have said, we must entrust this power somewhere, and we must proceed on the assumption that an officer clothed with power will exercise it with discretion and good faith. In addition I see this advantage. I know that men in the rural districts charged with the administration of road funds and road laws, however conscientious and earnest they may be, can not in many cases be skilled road engineers. For this reason the recent road legislation of Missouri extends the aid of the State highway department to the local road authorities.

The highway commission, upon the application of a road district, will send an engineer to provide a scientific plan of road construction and give advice as to the utilization of the best material for road improvement. Without that the rural-road official is often helpless; he must pursue the archaic methods of constructing roads, which, as we know, often resulted in no improvement of the road system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like two minutes more.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. What is now being done under the modern legislation by State highway commissions is proposed to be done under this bill by the Federal road department, and will result in real road improvement. All of the scientific knowledge which has been gathered by the Office of Good Roads will become available for the people. The Secretary of Agriculture will be able to put at the service of the local road officials in the State the services of experts familiar with the construction of roads brought from different parts of the country; familiar with the quality of road material available in the different sections; familiar with the processes of drainage which is an important feature in roads; familiar with all the details which reduce the cost of the roads and result in a more economical upkeep. I take it that the aid to be thus given will be of great benefit. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will,

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does not the commissioner of agriculture make a certificate to be joined in by the director of highways? Must not the director of highways join in a certificate before the Treasury is obliged to pay any of this amount?

Mr. BORLAND. I suppose the gentleman means the director of highways in the State. He has the opportunity of initiative himself. Any plan which he desires approved by the Federal Government he can present, and then the Federal Government can have an opportunity to approve of it, and if it does, he will get aid in carrying out the improvement, maintenance, and providing for the roads.

Good roads are the golden chain that binds the Nation together for prosperity or defense. They lighten the burden of transportation, reduce the cost of living, raise the value of farm lands, increase the national efficiency, provide for the common defense, build up the church and school, banish the isolation of rural life, and spread prosperity, intelligence, and social advantages throughout the length and breadth of the land. We are just entering upon an era of road improvement which will make our national wealth and strength available, and I am glad to have had a part in the formation of this legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts the other day referred to the fact that there were some States that were favoring this bill that had been derelict in the duty they owed the public in road building. The State from which I come has not been slow in building public roads. The State of Indiana has more miles of improved roads than any other State in the Union. [Applause.] We are not content with the roads we have, we want more and better roads.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. GORDON. I will ask you the question I was going to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Borland] when his time expired. Does the gentleman know of any precedent in national legislation for taking public money out of the Treasury of the United States and using it on township roads such as is proposed under this bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; there is ample precedent for the expenditure of public money for the improvement of public roads. The United States Government, for the purpose of encouraging the diffusion of agriculture and the knowledge pertaining to agriculture, is contributing to-day to every agricultural educational establishment in the United States a certain amount of money for every student that enters the agricultural department. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. But that is not roads. I am talking about township roads.

Mr. MANN. We are building roads now out of an appropriation of \$500,000 made last year, in the Post Office bill, which the gentleman from Ohio and myself both voted for.

Mr. SLOAN. The Constitution of the United States expressly provides for the establishment of post roads throughout the United States.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. But that is not the only precedent.

Mr. KELLEY. There is the Cumberland road.

Mr. GORDON. And that was built by an appropriation of public land.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The United States is likewise paying to every technical school in the United States where there is a military establishment as an incident thereto a certain amount of money for each student there engaged. But that is not the only precedent where the same principle is applied. Some of the States of the Union have seen fit, out of their generosity, to establish old soldiers' homes, where an old soldier and his wife may spend their last days together, and for the encouragement of that kind of philanthropy the United States Government contributes for every male in those institutions \$100 per year. The General Government has no claim upon those institutions and has no claim upon these agricultural colleges except the general good that the general public receives. Nor has the United States any claim upon these young men who graduate from these institutions or receive their military education there except that in time of war it may have an educated yeomanry from whom it may draw in defense of the country.

The only objection I know of that can possibly come from the State of Indiana is because of the fact that we have some people there who believe that we should not be encumbered with a State highway commission. To my mind that is one of the best possible things that can result to the State of Indiana by reason of this legislation.

As I have stated, we have built in the last 25 years more roads than any other State in the Union, but we have built

them in a sort of slipshod manner, without any system, and there should be a system. In order that the greatest and best results may be obtained from the money invested there should be some central system, some scheme whereby the roads are built according to a common plan. That, to my mind, is one of the great benefits that is to be derived from this system. We are not complaining because the State of Indiana will contribute more money than she gets back by reason of this legislation. We do not feel that we in the State of Indiana are independent any more than the people in our adjoining States to the west are independent of one another. We feel that we are dependent and interdependent, each one of us striving as best we can to assist the others. If this idea of isolation advanced by some gentlemen here in opposition to this bill were to obtain, what would become of our educational system in this country? Take, for example, the State of Indiana. The great centers of population there contribute by far the greater amount of money that goes into the educational fund of the State; but it all goes into one pot and it is divided among all the school children throughout the State, so that the child living in the remotest district has the same educational advantages as the child who lives in a congested center.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. You do not know of any law that takes money out of the United States Treasury, though, and contributes it to the States for the education of the youth of the States, do you?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Why, certainly I know of a law, and it is a most wholesome one. I referred to it a while ago. Money is contributed by the United States Government to every agricultural school in this country, so that this country may be a better one to live in, and so that the people of the United States may have diffused among them a greater amount of knowledge on the subject of agriculture and be able to use to better advantage the opportunities which they have.

Mr. GORDON. But the National Government has never contributed any money to support the common schools of the State, has it?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It might do it. There is no reason why it should not.

Mr. GORDON. Of course it might.

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. It gave public lands for the support of the common schools in the States.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It did; yes. For the purpose of supporting the common schools in this country she gave thousands and thousands of her broad acres. [Applause.] Is not that a contribution worth while? We want to encourage other States in the improvement of their highways. Take the great State of Illinois, for example, that lies to the west of us—disgraceful, so far as her lack of road improvement is concerned. It is a fact known to be true that gentlemen who live in the southern part of the State of Illinois will go across the Ohio River into Kentucky and go on east until they get to a point south of the Indiana line, and then go the whole length of the State of Indiana to the city of Chicago. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there is a road traversible leading through Indiana to Chicago on the Indiana side of the State line?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. And if it were not for those roads on the Indiana State line, by automobile, nine months out of the year, the people in the southern part of the gentleman's State could not reach Chicago.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the gentleman has not been over the road I will forgive him, but if he has I am afraid he has forgotten something. I have been there a good many times, and a man takes his life in his hands if he travels over those roads in the northern part of Indiana in any way.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know of any reason at all why anybody in Indiana would want to go to Chicago on any kind of road? [Laughter.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Perhaps that is an answer to the gentleman's question?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman's statement is true, and also the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, is it not an additional reason why this bill ought to pass?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent a district in the extreme southern portion of the State of Illinois, and I bear witness that the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] is absolutely correct.

Mr. MANN. I think that is a strange statement to come from a gentleman from the great State of Illinois.

Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS. It is true all over the State of Illinois.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune to be present at the Dixie Highway Convention held in Chattanooga during the past summer, and it was one of the grandest conventions that I ever attended. One would have thought it was either the national Republican or Democratic convention, so great was the enthusiasm. The gentlemen who represented the State of Illinois urged that a line or a branch line be established through the State of Illinois for the reason, and for the sole reason, that they might be encouraged and their citizenship encouraged to better road building. I did not refer to this matter to make any invidious comparison or to cast any reflection upon the great State of Illinois, for it is one of the greatest States in the Union, and their farm lands are unsurpassed by those in any other State because of their richness, and because of that fact she ought to be ashamed that she has not better roads alongside of them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Has the gentleman ever been up in Michigan?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; and there is room for improvement up there. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, they have good farm land up there.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; they have. So, I say, there is every reason why this bill should be enacted into law. I am happy in the thought that there will be no partisanship manifested here in consideration of the bill. Republicans have ever encouraged this character of improvement for the purpose of keeping the young men and the young women on the farms and away from the congested cities of the country. They encouraged and, if you please, made possible the first rural post route in these United States, and they did it for that purpose. Rural post routes had their preliminary trial under a Republican administration when Mr. Harrison was President of the United States. It was killed by the second Cleveland administration and permitted to slumber until the administration of McKinley, when it was revived, and it has gone on doing the work for which it was intended since that time; and I am sorry to say that it remains for this present administration to so revolutionize the Rural System of the country that they are depleting it, so far as its efficiency is concerned, and taking away from the farmer the benefit that it was intended he should receive by reason of it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman if I understood him to say that the only thing lacking in order to stimulate the people of his State to more activity in road improvement is a contribution on the part of the Federal Government of over \$1,000,000, which his State would get under this bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No, sir; if the gentleman understood me to say that, he understood wrong; but I do say, sir—

Mr. WALSH. I so understood the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do say that we are not a hermit State. We are willing to make our roads good, that the pleasure of the Bostonese may be made the greater in going from Boston to the city of Chicago. There is not a day when weather is passable but what there are passing, not only one, two, but dozens of them, through the center of the State of Indiana, automobiles from New York City, from Boston, and, strange as it may seem, there were untold thousands of this character of tourists who made the trip this year from Boston clear through to San Francisco. We are past the days when State lines blind citizenship. We are arriving at a time when local citizenship, by reason of the growth of our transportation system, is becoming national in character. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do.

Mr. GORDON. Why not confine the contributions of the Federal Government to interstate roads, which would answer the very purpose the gentleman has described?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Every State road will become after a while an interstate road. [Applause.] Every State road is now an interstate road, for all these little feeders—

Mr. GORDON. There is a mistake there. This bill does specifically provide that this money is authorized to be used for local township roads leading to and from the county seat.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; it does not provide for anything other than—

Mr. GORDON. Let me read to you, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Let the gentleman take and study that while I progress, and then I will answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. I have read the bill, and I will ask the gentleman what this provision in the bill means:

That the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Is not that a local system of roads, purely?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Its main purpose is to make these roads feeders for these larger roads, and there could not be a complete system of roads by simply a grand trunk line; there must be a system of roads to reach it to make it comprehensive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Can the gentleman yield me five minutes more?

Mr. DUNN. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. All classes are interested in the question of transportation, interested in getting the thing desired from the place of its origin to the place of its consumption as expeditiously and as cheaply as possible.

Our great arteries of transportation are the railroads, rivers, lakes, and canals. The wagon roads are the veins and feeders. All are interested in having these veins and feeders so numerous and so well improved that the great arteries of trade may prove the greatest success possible to all the people. All classes, therefore, are interested in good roads.

It has been offered as an objection to this character of legislation that the rich automobilist is the one most interested in the construction of good roads, but I undertake to say that this gentleman has not as much real interest in the construction of roads as the workingman in the great commercial centers, who, perchance, never travels upon country highways at all. True, the tourist and the automobilist who go on pleasure bent are interested in good roads, and through their advocating the same much interest has been aroused throughout this country, and through this agitation much legislation in different States looking to the betterment of country highways has been enacted into law. But in the last analysis the real and lasting benefit derived from this character of improvement is not to the tourist. He is rather to be looked upon as a contributing member. He toils not, but he spends his money along the line over which he travels, which results in benefit to the butcher and the baker, and puts more money in circulation for the benefit of the community in general.

Every merchant is interested in good roads, for the reason that they increase his trade by putting him in closer and more immediate touch with the farmer.

The workingman who lives year in and year out within smoke-begrimed cities and factory districts and who does not use the public highways at all is interested in good roads, because every article that he consumes is affected more or less by the condition of the public highways throughout the country. The cost of living is influenced by the roads of the country, and to a greater degree than most people realize.

The railroads, rivers, lakes, and canals are all interested in good wagon roads, for they depend for their very existence upon these byways and highways of transportation.

Transportation begins at the place of original production and ends at the place of final consumption. So our great cities and great export centers are also interested in good roads and in their construction and maintenance.

The farmers of this country are vitally interested in road betterment, and anything that affects the farmer affects the citizen in every other walk of life. Farming is the greatest science in the world and has been practiced since the beginning of time, yet it seems there is the least known about it of any of the sciences. This fact is just beginning to dawn upon the farmer himself. The great agricultural schools, located in many of the States of the Union and assisted by the United States Government, through their scientific researches, are bringing home to the farmer the possibilities of the soil. They are teaching him how to revivify farm lands long since considered worthless, and to make these farms produce more than they did when they were first turned from virgin soil. They now fully realize that they can not constantly take away from soil productiveness and put nothing back to replenish, and expect a continuation of good crops. In consequence, through crop rotation and scientific fertilization, the soil is growing constantly more productive. Through the marvelous ingenuity of the inventor, farm life has been revolutionized in the last quarter of a century, and it is not now the drudgery it once was. Gas-

line and electricity have been wonderful factors in farm improvement. They have revolutionized the work on the farm, until to-day we have in this country farms that are actually conducted without horses; and it will not be 10 years until the great farming interests of this country generally will be conducted from start to finish, from the planting of the seed to the harvesting of the grain and to the hauling of that grain to market, without the intervention of a horse. And with all these changes in the life of the farmer has come the desire for better roads, has come the knowledge of the necessity of better roads, has come the demand that must be met in their building and maintenance, if we are to secure from the farm the greatest good for the greatest number.

The farmer now realizes that it is necessary for him to keep books; that it is necessary for him to know the cost of production, to know the productive value of everything upon the farm, from the egg-laying value of the hen to the butter-fat producing capacity of the cow. He knows how and when to get rid of the drones. In arriving at these conclusions he must of necessity know the value of good roads for the accommodation of his farm.

One of the greatest items of expense to the farmer is that of transportation, and that expense is not alone to the farmer, it is to the consumer as well. It costs so much money to haul a ton of produce from the farm to the railroad station, and that sum of money results either in a loss to the farmer or else is contributed by the ultimate consumer. The time once was when this item was not reckoned by the farmer at all, but that time is past with the successful farmer. It may be of interest to know that it costs from 25 to 30 cents per ton per mile to handle the farm produce of this country from the farm to the railroad or wharf. Railroads handle the same produce on hauls of 30 miles and less at 2 cents per ton per mile, and where the haul is 150 miles or over it is made at a cost of one-half cent per ton per mile.

Great ado has been made about the freight rates charged by the railroads of the country and because of the effect of that charge upon the high cost of living. These railroad freight charges are practically nothing when compared with the wagon-road freight charge. And if the people will study this proposition of public-highway betterment from an economic standpoint as well as a purely selfish one, all will agree that money expended in highway improvement is a mutual benefit.

France has the greatest roads of any country in the world. She has 400,000 miles of macadam country road. She looks upon them as one of her greatest assets, as avenues of cheap transportation from factory and farm. In consequence of these splendid roads the product of the factory and farm in France is carried to market for less than one-third of what it costs to carry to market in this country.

It took centuries for France to build these good roads, and in getting them she went through all the primitive forms and trials that our country has and is going through in its endeavor to get good roads, and no doubt wasted as much money as we have wasted before they learned how best to build their roads and to get the greatest results from the money expended thereon. Originally France had no road system. Everybody made his own road. After a while a few neighbors organized a road district; after a while a few neighborhoods joined in a highway district; after a while turnpike acts were passed authorizing the creation of toll roads; and after long years came the agitation for national assistance, which was finally granted and national supervision exercised over the building of roads. All roads were built with reference to a system under scientific methods, and the result, the wonderful road system of France.

If this bill is enacted into law it will be the beginning of a Nation-wide system of good road building in the United States. Through it, and the additional legislation that will come from year to year as necessity demands it, road building will be reduced to a science.

Some of the older States are far behind some of the younger States in the roads that they have built. This law will awaken these old States from their lethargy and inspire within them a State pride to be up and doing in the matter of road building, that they may not longer be subjected to criticism by their neighboring States.

The State and the Nation should act together in making these improvements for they are of like interest to the State and the Nation, and every road built under this law will be a new bond binding closer the relation of State and Nation.

In these times of war and rumors of war the Nation should awaken to its interest in good roads everywhere throughout all the States, for there is nothing that facilitates the progress of an army as much as good roads and there is nothing that re-

tards it more than bad roads. The item of transportation is the greatest with which a nation has to do in time of war.

The era of good road building is at hand. It is being taught in the agricultural schools throughout many of the States. It is being taught in farmers' institutes all over the land. It is being advocated by commercial clubs in every city of any consequence. Good-road congresses are being held in every State. All of which affords convincing proof that the people throughout the country are in favor of this character of legislation, for they realize that the progress of a State or Nation is best evidenced by its good roads. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the comparatively small number in the Sixty-third Congress who voted against a similar proposal that was before the House about two years ago. I think there were only 42 at that time who were recorded in the negative. I am inclined to think there will be a considerably larger number when a vote is reached upon this measure. I am still opposed to the bill. I see no reason to alter my opinion as a result of the changes which have been made in the text of the measure. Nevertheless, I do not think it is wholly bad. There are some provisions in it which are worthy of the attention and the approval of the House. For instance, the requirement that the States themselves must contribute before they can share in the disposition of the Federal fund is a highly desirable thing. There would be less agitation to-day against river and harbor measures, less clamor that they are nothing but pork-barrel and logrolling legislation if every State had to back up its own projects by substantial contributions before it could receive a penny from the Federal Treasury. While the principle of contribution contained in the present bill is sound, the percentage which the State must contribute is much too small. Instead of the Government being pledged to put in from 30 to 50 per cent, as the measure requires, it should probably not be pledged to put in more than one-third or one-half that percentage—say, 10 to 25 per cent of the total cost of the road making.

In other words, the measure ought so to be designed as to stimulate to the greatest possible degree activity by the States themselves. If there were a larger percentage required of the States, it would have that effect and would extend the making of roads much faster than is likely to be the case under the present measure, because the same amount of Federal money would go so much farther.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman mean to state that this bill provides that the Federal Government should pay from 50 to 70 per cent?

Mr. ROGERS. No; 30 to 50 per cent.

Mr. BLACK. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not think there is a great deal of force in the suggestion put forth by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] and concurred in the other day by my colleague [Mr. WALSH] that the passage of this measure would tend to have a paralyzing influence upon State activity in road making. I think it would have a stimulating rather than a benumbing influence; to my mind that objection is not sound.

My fundamental objections to this measure are three: The Federal Government should not embark upon this project at all; it certainly should not, in any event, be undertaken at this time of stress or unless we can afford it; the basis of distribution is illogical and unfair.

In the first place, this is not a proper activity for the Federal Government to undertake. Why? I can not answer any better or any more succinctly than the committee has done in its report recommending the passage of this bill. On page 4 of the report it says:

Roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of the States to provide them for their people.

"Roads are local concerns." It is true that under the Constitution, stretched and strained, it may be within the power of Congress to enact a bill of this sort; but, after all, if we examine the question fairly and carefully, we must recognize

that roads are local concerns and should be treated as such. I think there could not be a better illustration of that than the fact that in all of the years of this Government only one proposal for Federal construction of a road has been adopted by the Congress, and that was something like a century ago.

"Roads are local concerns." Yet the administration of this bill will result in the creation of a horde of Federal road inspectors, prowling over the country to look at a corduroy road, and incidentally giving the more patronage to the party in power. It is one more and a long step toward bureaucracy and indefensible centralization.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Was the gentleman speaking of the Cumberland road?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Does not the gentleman know that all the public lands in the States through which that road passed were charged with the contribution of 5 per cent of all the proceeds of sales, for the express purpose of making that road?

Mr. ROGERS. There was a contributory scheme in that measure, just as there is in this. I do not think it is a precedent, however, for the passage of legislation like this. Here we have a measure involving a yearly expenditure by the United States of \$25,000,000. Yet "roads are local concerns."

Whether roads are good things or bad things is not the question. If that were the issue before the House to-day, there would not be a man who would speak or who would vote in opposition to this measure. Everybody would be for it, for of course they are good things. But that is not the same as saying that it is desirable for this Federal Congress to aid them by the expenditure of a very large sum of money.

There is often a tendency in this House and in every other legislature to decide a matter involving expenditure as if the sole question were whether it was a desirable thing. Whether or not it is attractive seems to be the test, not whether we can afford the expenditure. We are all agreed that good roads are desirable. They tend to bring the city and country together. They tend to assist people in leaving the congested centers and going out through the countryside, and, indirectly, in thus reducing the high cost of living. Of course they are a good thing, but that is not saying that we should undertake them through the aid of Federal appropriations. That, it seems to me, is the real test of this measure, and that is primarily why I am opposed to it. Schools are a good thing. Shall we therefore take schools out of the hands of the State or the city and town and turn them over, together with one-third or one-half the expense of the school system throughout the country, to the Central Government?

A good deal has been said on the floor, and the same is clearly to be inferred from the committee report, to the effect that we are paying rental for these post roads. I quote again from the report of the committee. On page 4, it says:

It would be less expensive and more expedient to use the roads of the States as post roads than it would to construct and maintain an independent system. In such case it would seem but just that the General Government should make some contribution to the construction and maintenance of the roads which it thus uses.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Would it be asking too much for the gentleman to read the paragraph from the beginning? It is very short.

Mr. ROGERS. I will read the rest of it if you wish.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The part you want to read is in the beginning.

Mr. ROGERS. The part before that which I have read?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. It reads:

To carry and deliver the mail is a function of the Federal Government, and it is its duty to provide itself with the facilities necessary to a proper performance of this function, such as postmasters, post offices, and post roads. A post road is just as truly a postal facility as is a post office. As in most rural communities, it has been found less expensive and more expedient to rent post offices than to build them, so it would be less expensive and more expedient to use the roads of the State as post roads than it would to construct and maintain an independent system.

The point I want to make is that this language is predicated upon a rental idea; the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who has spoken this afternoon, very clearly and specifically put it upon that same ground. But look at the percentage that we are paying toward the cost of these roads under the guise of rent. In rural sections the carrier will, it is true, go over a country road once a day, or perhaps twice a day, for the delivery of his mail. But if from that circumstance, so

mightily useful to the local communities, flows an obligation to pay rent, it necessarily follows that every use, however trivial, of city or State or county instrumentalities by the Government should be likewise compensated for by something in the nature of rent. Take, for example, the delivery of mails in our cities. The city carriers go about the streets 5, or perhaps 10, times a day for the delivery of the mail. If it is true that we should pay on the basis of rent for country roads which are traversed perhaps once or twice a day by rural carriers, why does not it necessarily follow that we ought to pay much heavier rent for the use of the city streets and city sidewalks by city carriers? I see no escape from that conclusion.

But even if the rental idea is to be defended at all, can anybody seriously urge that from 30 to 50 per cent of the total cost of the roads ought to be borne by the Federal Government for its trifling uses of them? I think that question carries with it its own answer. Yet that is the only theory, under the Constitution, by which Congress gets jurisdiction and has power to enact this law.

It is natural, of course, that the measure should be popular. Any measure which involves a "grab" is always popular. We all know how difficult it is to secure any specific economy. Somebody wants an appropriation, and the rest of us are pretty prone to help him get it, because we may need his help later. I do not think it is fair to say in justification of this bill that it is desired by a large proportion of this House or perhaps by a large proportion of the States of the Union. Of course they want it. But it is our duty to consider that this \$25,000,000 a year—a very large sum of money—is being called for at a time when the Nation is already being very heavily taxed, and at a time when we all know that vastly greater taxes are likely to be put upon the people in connection with the program for national defense. Assuming that this bill should have been passed years ago, or that it, perhaps, should be passed at some time in the future, I can see no more inopportune time than the present to bring it before this House and make it a part of the law of the land—at a time when we have so many critical conditions confronting us, and when we have such need of enormous revenues with which to carry out the necessary plans for the security of the Nation.

Of course that argument will not appeal to certain Members like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY], who spoke yesterday, and perhaps not to the majority leader of the House [Mr. KITCHIN] and those who follow him in certain points of view which he entertains. But from the point of view of the vast majority of this House, who, I hope, are believers in large appropriations for national defense, I do not see how, either on the majority side or on the minority side, they can consistently and conscientiously advocate a measure of this sort.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, no one can oppose good roads. The primary questions are, in the first place, whether we can, at the present time, afford, as a Government, to expend \$25,000,000 a year for good roads; and, in the second place, whether it is a proper activity for the Federal Government to undertake at all. There is also the consideration of whether or not this measure is equitable in its distribution of funds among the several States.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ROGERS. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS. I will yield to the gentleman for a brief question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman is talking about preparedness. Does he know of any way by which \$25,000,000 could be used for preparedness to better advantage under the present circumstances and at the present time than by the building of good roads?

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] made a complete answer to that inquiry in his questioning of the last speaker. The bill does not contemplate using this money exclusively, or at all, for military roads or even for interstate roads. That would be a different proposal. But here every lane and highway and byway of the Nation may be the recipient of Federal funds. The very first sentence in the bill says:

That for the purposes of this act the term "rural post roads" shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried.

Any little cow path is just as much entitled to this aid as the Lincoln Highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss this question upon the basis of whether or not the apportionment among the States is as fair as it might be made. Members favoring the bill admit that it is purely arbitrary. I realize that it is a difficult matter to make the apportionment upon any accurate and scientific basis, and I think that very difficulty suggests one of the inherent objections to the bill itself. That phase of the question was very fully handled and very adequately analyzed by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and I do not care to go into it at this time. The proposed division is based upon a combination of three tests—ratio of population, ratio of post roads, and a fixed sum. But, after all, the population of the several States does not in itself constitute a proper basis for this division. Neither is the proportion of post routes in a State a fair basis of distribution; and the giving of a fixed sum outright to each State—Nevada and New York alike—of course has no possible defense. It was not even carried in the bill as introduced by the chairman of the committee in the last Congress.

I suppose if we were to have this apportionment made along logical lines the fairest method would be based upon the amount of mail carried in each State. That would entail consideration of the Federal use of the roads in the several States, and it seems to me would have a more direct bearing upon the proper division than any one of the three tests proposed in this bill.

This bill is not a desirable one for Massachusetts and similar States. Gentlemen favoring the bill have generally admitted that, but, very sincerely, no doubt, have asserted that Massachusetts thrives in other ways at the expense of her sister States, and that her sister States ought in this legislation to thrive at her expense. Of course, that is not a reason why we in Massachusetts like it, although it may be an excellent reason why we may have to see it passed. Massachusetts is a rich State, and we are proud to have it a rich State. I dare say it is fair for her to pay more than her share, but of the \$25,000,000 that is to be raised yearly under this bill Massachusetts will contribute about 7 per cent of the total, according to the best estimate I can obtain, and the figures submitted by the committee show that in the aggregate she will get about 2.1 per cent in return. In other words, this bill costs Massachusetts about \$1,250,000 a year. We are willing and expect to do more than our share, as we have always done, but we submit that the disproportion in this bill is out of all reason.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I have sat and listened with great interest to the able, eloquent, and erudite speeches made by the Members of this House on the important questions with which the Sixty-fourth Congress will have to deal in the next few months, and questions which are so vital to the people of this country; but, gentlemen, I do not think Congress will have a question as important and one that affects so much the happiness, prosperity, and welfare of as many of the American people as this bill now pending for your consideration.

This bill is a cooperative measure and authorizes an annual appropriation of not exceeding \$25,000,000 from the Federal Government to all States, contingent upon the various States expending a like amount, and then apportions the \$25,000,000 among the States in the following manner: Sixty-five thousand dollars to each State and one half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all the States as shown by the latest Federal census, and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all States, as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

The building of good roads in this country is wholly an internal improvement, and the main purpose for constructing them is to make thoroughfares over which to transport the products and the people of the country. Improving the rivers and making them navigable is for the same purpose, but let us see how public roads have been discriminated against by the Federal Government in the appropriation of its money. I am not criticizing reasonable appropriations for rivers and harbors, but merely want to draw the contrast.

There are only 26,000 miles of navigable rivers in the Republic susceptible to improvement, while there are 2,228,042 miles of road, and yet the Federal Government has appropriated since it was organized \$475,211,250 on rivers alone, exclusive of harbors and canals, and it has not appropriated scarcely anything for good roads. Is this just or fair to the people?

It costs the American farmer more for hauling his products from his farm on unimproved roads to the depot or river landing

than from the depot or river landing to the market. His haulage on unimproved roads in the United States per ton per mile costs him on the products named below as follows: Corn, 19 cents; wheat, 19 cents; tobacco, 20 cents; cotton, 27 cents; hay, 19 cents; and potatoes, 19 cents. It costs him on an average of 23 cents per ton per mile on all the products he raises to haul them, and it costs the farmers of Europe with improved roads only as follows: France, 10 cents; England and Wales, 10 cents; Belgium, 9½ cents; and Germany, 8½ cents. The American farmer pays from 40 per cent to 95 per cent more for hauling his products from the farm to the railway station or river landing than the farmers of Europe. A ton of freight can be carried by steamer on the Great Lakes 1,000 miles for \$1.25; it can be carried by railroad 250 miles; it can be carried by electric conveyances 25 miles; and on an unimproved public road it can be carried only 3 miles for that price.

There are 878,798,000 acres of farm land in the United States worth \$28,475,674,000. The average per cent increase in the value of farms contiguous or in close proximity to good roads is from 75 per cent to 100 per cent. But let us be very conservative and say the average per cent increase is only 25 per cent. Now, if we had good roads all over this country, then instead of farm land being worth \$28,475,674,000 it would be worth 25 per cent more, or \$35,594,592,500, an increase in the market value of \$7,118,918,500. Would this not be a good investment for the Government?

Let us take an item of the Government business. There are now 1,073,099 miles of rural free-delivery routes and 147,480 miles of star mail routes in this country, a total of 1,220,579 miles of both. The cost of service of rural free delivery in 1915 was \$49,825,000, and the cost of the star route service for 1915 was \$8,675,000, a total cost of \$58,500,000. Everyone knows if all these rural and star routes were over good roads the year around the services could be maintained with the same efficiency for half that amount. If this is true, the Federal Government would save annually the sum of \$29,250,000 on these miles of rural and star routes, and besides the rural and star route carriers, whose consistent friend I am, would have good roads the year around over which to transact the Government's business. Is this not a saving of sufficient magnitude to appeal to the American people?

If this bill becomes a law, it would mean at least \$75,000,000 would be spent on the roads of this country every year, because every State in the Union, with the exception of Florida, Indiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, have State aid road laws to the counties, and every State has a highway commission, except Indiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas. Take as an example my State, Kentucky; in 1914 the State legislature passed a State aid law for the building of good roads by levying a 5-cent road tax, and segregated this tax together with the license tax on automobiles to the road fund. This fund amounted to about \$700,000 the first year. The act further provides that this money is available to the counties of the State for road purposes when the counties would expend a like sum. As a result, the first year after the law went into effect 104 out of the 120 counties of the State took advantage of the law, and as a result there were built last year over 400 miles of good rock road. [Applause.] The Committee on Roads estimates that Kentucky's proportion under this bill will be \$580,274. This amount being available, it means that the State of Kentucky will expend this much, and the counties in the State will expend this amount, consequently three times the amount of \$580,274 will be spent on good roads in Kentucky each year, and the same rule will apply with every other State whose law is like or similar to that of Kentucky. This law will not only aid and improve the rural communities of this country, but the cities and towns as well. Good roads will make the cities and towns more accessible, consequently more people will visit them, the same people will go more often, and by so doing will spend more money with the business enterprises of the cities and towns, and the natural result will be the market value of town and city property will increase, as well as the business of them.

There is a great talk of ample preparedness in this country. If we should be thrown into war with some foreign foe, and God forbid that we ever will, what would better prepare us for a successful combat with this enemy than to have good roads over which to transport our artillery, our armies, and our commissaries? There is nothing, in my judgment, that would prepare us better if war should ever come than to have splendid roads throughout this country.

I think it is high time the Federal Government was enacting some wholesome legislation that will be of direct benefit to the

American farmer. The appropriations to the Agricultural Department of the Government, the establishment of rural and star mail routes, and the induction of the parcel post have been about all the direct legislation that the Federal Government has enacted for the American farmer in many years. Why should we not legislate in the interest of the farmer? He owns \$69,467,124,000 of the wealth of this country, and pays more county, State, and Federal taxes in proportion to his worth than any other class of citizens of this Republic. The prosperity of the whole country depends upon the farmer. When he is prosperous, every other business thrives, and when he fails, bankruptcy inevitably follows. He is a wealth producer of this country, and not a parasite on its body politic. The American farmer added \$9,872,936,000 to the wealth of this country in 1914; give him good roads and he will add more. The last census shows that 49,348,833 people live in the rural portions of this country, one-half of its population. If good roads only benefited these, would not it be a good investment?

What is the main objection offered against this bill? It is the one urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. He opposes it because he thinks some States per chance would pay a little more of the pro rata of the appropriation authorized by this bill than they should, and in return would not receive quite as much of the apportionment as is due them. Is this the circumscribed view that shall be taken on national legislation coming before this Congress? For over a hundred years the rural communities have been furnishing New England the raw material which has fed her spindles of industry and made them hum the tune of prosperity to her people. We were glad to be able to do this. We rejoice with you upon the progress and advancement you have made, and congratulate you on the grandeur of your achievements. We are all proud of the great cities of the East, because they are in America, and thanks to an all-wise Providence, the same flag that is kissed by the sea breezes as it floats over smoky New York and Boston is caressed by the gentle zephyrs of summer in Kentucky and other rural States of this Republic. I now want to extend an invitation to my good friend from Boston [Mr. WALSH] to come and visit old Kentucky. I want him one time to breathe the pure air of the country; to look one time at Heaven's cloudless dome; to gaze with delight one time at the brilliancy of the stars in a smokeless sky; to meet and mingle with her brave, loyal, and hospitable people, in a State where chivalry and hospitality are prerequisites to a successful career, where gallantry is the yardstick with which all men are measured and judged, and where pure womanhood is always respected and defended. When the gentleman shall have done this and returned to the "Hub of the Universe," I am satisfied that his views on national legislation will be broadened and his provincial viewpoint will be greatly magnified. [Prolonged applause.]

But above all benefits that will accrue to this country in dollars and cents, as I have tried to show, yet, in my judgment, there is a better and more lofty reason why we should have good roads in this country—the social benefit that will be derived. I was born and reared on the farm, a farm by which ran unimproved roads, and I know the disadvantages and hardships which surround it. However, I am glad of my early environment, as it brings experiences to a boy that will benefit him in after life that he can get nowhere else.

Let us have good roads so the bright-eyed boys and girls of the country, on whose shoulders soon will rest the perpetuity of this great Republic, can attend the country schools and prepare themselves for this great task without getting into the mud and mire. Give us good roads so the splendid farmer and his family can attend the country church and enjoy that great prerogative, which was bought by the patriotic blood of our forefathers, to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and to do so out of the mud and mire.

Good roads would prevent the high cost of living to a great extent. We hear so much these days the slogan, "Back to the farm." When a stalwart young man leaves the farm and goes to the city or town the power of production is impaired that much and the consuming class is increased in that proportion; hence the high cost of living. What could be a greater inducement for the farmer boy to return from the city back to the farm than for him to know that the farm is now accessible by good roads? What could add more to the happiness and comfort of the farmer than good roads? If we had good roads, that boy would go back to the farm. When he grew tired of hearing the whirr of the spindles of industry of the great cities and when he grew weary of the congestion of people in the crowded marts of trade he would go back to the farm. He would stop, think of and contemplate the happy association of bygone years spent on the farm, and he would go back. He

would cherish the happy recollections of the long ago in the sentiment of the poet, when he said:

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled,
Like the vase in which roses have long been distilled;
You may break, you may shatter the vase if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang 'round it still.

On behalf of over 12,000,000 industrious farmers of the country, I appeal to you to support this bill. I believe you will, and when this bill shall become a law of this great Republic over 49,000,000 of people around their family firesides in the rural portions of this great country will pronounce heaven's choicest benediction upon every Member of this House who gave his support to this important measure. [Loud and continuous applause.]

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed that a committee of this House, a committee presumably controlled by friends of the administration of President Wilson, should bring in a bill of this character at this time. If there were no shadow of menace upon our prosperity and no serious foreign complications that threaten the maintenance of peace with foreign nations, and if at the same time there were an abundant surplus in the Treasury, there might be some excuse for such a bill. But none of these conditions are present. Our continued prosperity and the maintenance of peace are threatened, and the country is already burdened with extraordinary direct taxation of such a nature as to cause much criticism and complaint.

Nor is this all. The President in his address to the Members of the two Houses of the Congress on December 7 told us that the most important matter before the country to-day, the matter that lay at the very front of his whole thought as he addressed us, is the matter of national defense. He outlined a program, and then he added in words that ought to be burned into the minds of every patriotic American citizen:

At least so much by way of preparation for defense seems to me to be absolutely imperative now. We can not do less.

We can not do less, Mr. Chairman; we can not do less and continue to dwell in safety, and the President clearly implies that we ought to do more. The program of military and naval expenditures which the President outlined as the least we could do, the program that he regards and that every patriotic American citizen who has given the subject any serious study regards as the least we can do, as "absolutely imperative now," calls for an additional expenditure of almost \$100,000,000, the estimate given being \$93,800,000.

This will involve still more extraordinary taxation, direct taxation; yet gentlemen claiming to be friends of President Wilson and supporters of his administration bring into this House, and have the temerity to advocate a bill of this kind, a bill to distribute \$25,000,000 from the Federal Treasury among the States, \$25,000,000 that is not in the Treasury, and can not be got there unless by still more and higher extraordinary direct taxation.

I am amazed, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, that any committee controlled by Democrats should bring in such a bill at this time. The fact that it is now before us and that its passage has been strongly advocated by Democrats on the floor of this House points directly to one of two conclusions—either the Democrats who advocate it are not friends of President Wilson and are seeking to do everything they can to embarrass and retard the program that he regards as of the highest importance, or else they are utterly reckless and willing to place their petty, personal district interests above the interest of the country. There are Republicans, Mr. Chairman, who will vote for this bill on the theory that theirs is not the responsibility for the taxation that must follow. In accordance with the political ethics of the day, they have no hesitation in voting to embarrass an administration controlled by the Democratic Party. The country will probably have no high regard for their patriotism, but their districts may forgive them if some of the pork finds its way into local barrels. But what shall be said of Democrats who pursue such a policy? Will they not be regarded as traitors? Will the bribe of a few paltry dollars for their districts procure them forgiveness?

Mr. Chairman, this distribution of money which we have not got masquerades as a good roads bill. As a good roads bill it is a humbug. It does not distribute enough money in proportion to the mileage of roads in the country to scrape the mud off the roads once a year. There are some 2,000,000 miles of highways in this great country, for the alleged "improvement" of which this \$25,000,000 might be used—a little more than \$12 a mile. Why, Mr. Chairman, really good roads, ac-

cording to present standards, cost a thousand times as much as that, and even bad roads cost a hundred times as much.

There are 1,204,262 miles of roads, according to the report of the committee, over which rural-delivery carriers or star-route carriers travel in the Postal Service. If the distribution of this money were confined to these roads, which the bill does not require, it makes only \$20 a mile—a sum not worth considering. But gentlemen who advocate this bill will say the money is not to be distributed on each mile of road. It might be so used under the terms of the bill, but suppose it is all used in new construction. In that case all the money allotted to more than half of the States might well be used in one county of those States. As a sop to the small States the \$65,000 minimum has been put in, but even with that sop only 17 States receive more than \$500,000. One county in Michigan bonded itself for \$600,000 not long ago for improved roads, and I have no doubt that the same thing has been done in many other States. In my own State we have spent four times this whole \$25,000,000 in the past four or five years on our roads, and the amount allotted to New York will not match our maintenance charges alone. In short, in whatever way this money is spent, it is not enough to make a showing. If you want the Federal Government to do something for the roads of the country that the people can see, you must at least multiply this annual authorization in this bill by 10 and make it \$250,000,000 instead of \$25,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the report of this Committee on Roads accompanying this bill says that "a post road is just as truly a postal facility as a post office," and goes on to say that "it would seem but just that the General Government should make some contribution to the construction and maintenance of the roads which it thus uses"; that is, for rural routes. Pure humbug! In whose interest are the rural delivery routes maintained; in the interest of the General Government, considered as a business corporation, or in the interest of the people who receive mail on the routes? Does the General Government make money out of the rural routes, or does it, on the contrary, lose money and maintain the routes for other than reasons of profit? Everybody knows that there is a tremendous loss in the Rural Delivery Service which is maintained, and rightly so, to give our farmers and dwellers in the open country that daily touch with the cities and the world which they ought to have. Every rural community gladly maintains its rural delivery roads at such a standard as the Post Office Department sees fit to set as a condition precedent to the establishment and maintenance of the routes, and if the department desires better roads it has only to raise the standard. Hence there is not only no necessity for any such distribution of money as this for the purpose of facilitating the distribution of the mail, but no sense in it whatever.

The bill is properly characterized as a "pork-barrel" bill. It is just that and nothing else. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7617, and had come to no resolution thereon.

PARCEL POST.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the parcel post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—SANFORD TIMMONS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. ASHBROOK to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Sanford Timmons, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR VARDAMAN.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein an address made by Senator VARDAMAN to the people of the State of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 22, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury submitting a change in estimate of appropriation for salaries, office of Assistant Treasurer at New York, as printed on pages 58 and 59 of the annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 611), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LEVER, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9419) to appropriate money to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to license and inspect warehouses, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 60), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 515) providing for the purchase or construction of cutters for the Coast Guard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 64), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7613) to authorize the Terral Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River near Terral, Jefferson County, Okla., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 61), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8233) granting the consent of Congress to the Republic Iron & Steel Co. to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 62), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6854) permitting the Wolf Point Bridge & Development Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River, in the State of Montana, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 63), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8068) for the relief of E. C. Hornor; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 9450) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Allen; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7132) granting an increase of pension to William W. Tinch; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7123) granting a pension to Joel Dyer; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8985) to correct the military record of Robert M. Adams, deceased; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 8567) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Brown; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9658) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9659) providing for the purchase of lands for an aviation school; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 9660) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9661) to reimburse the State of Illinois for money expended by the State of Illinois for payment for stock destroyed under direction of the United States and the State of Illinois to check the spread of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 9662) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Elk City, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9663) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Clinton, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9664) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mangum, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 9665) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hawkinsville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 9666) to authorize the Catawissa Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a railroad bridge across the west branch of the Susquehanna River from the borough of Milton, Northumberland County, Pa., to the borough of West Milton, Union County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9667) to authorize the Shamokin, Sunbury & Lewisburg Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a railroad bridge across the Susquehanna River from the borough of Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa., to Monroe Township, Snyder County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 9668) to create a department of the Public Health Service for the prevention and propagation of tuberculosis in the prisons of the United States, both Federal and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 9669) to authorize the Washington & Maryland Railway Co., successor to the Baltimore & Washington Transit Co., of Maryland, to operate its lines within the District of Columbia by using an electrical circuit, which may be completed through the earth; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9670) to authorize the Washington & Maryland Railway Co. to use for its tracks, without any payment to the Treasurer of the United States on account thereof, the subway on Cedar Street under the tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 9671) to protect the public against dishonest advertising and false pretenses in merchandising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 9672) for the purpose of expending the unexpended balances and surplus postal revenues on rural post roads; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 9673) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9674) to prevent the sale or transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than the time herein specified, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9675) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Loyal Order of Moose; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9676) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Order of Owls; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9677) prohibiting the issuance of permits, licenses, or receipts for special tax authorizing the sale of intoxicating liquors in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 9678) to exempt from compulsory pilotage the barges while in tow of steam vessels navigated by Government pilots; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9679) making an appropriation for a series of investigations and experiments for the purpose of devising a system of frost prevention in the fruit-growing sections of the Rocky Mountain region of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for the surveying of the unsurveyed lands in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9681) to advance funds for the construction of the Silverton-Durango public highway within the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9682) granting to the State of Colorado 1,000,000 acres of public land within the State for expenses incurred in suppressing Indian disturbances from 1865 to 1888, including the Ute War of 1887; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9683) authorizing and directing the Director of the Geological Survey to cause to be made a complete topographic and hydrographic survey of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9684) conveying Trappers Lake to the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9685) concerning the mineral springs of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9686) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to more effectually suppress and prevent the spread of diseases of potatoes known as black scab and wart disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9687) making an appropriation to prevent blight and to exterminate pests destructive of the potato and alfalfa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9688) providing for the expenditure of 25 per cent of the receipts from the national forests on road and trail construction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9689) requiring pensions to be paid monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9690) granting pensions to the survivors of certain Indian wars from the year 1865 to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9691) authorizing leave of absence to homestead settlers upon unsurveyed lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9692) to provide for a homestead entry on water-power sites; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9693) providing for camping grounds along public highways through forest reserves and other public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9694) defining procedure in case of protested or objected final proof on public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9695) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers and granting them 30 days' leave per annum; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9696) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9697) to prevent the desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9698) to declare Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9699) authorizing and validating certain exchanges of land between the United States and the several States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9700) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9701) to make "The Star-Spangled Banner" the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 9702) authorizing the construction, equipment, and operation of a research and experiment laboratory, to be located at a point to be selected by the Secretary of the Navy on the east or west shore of Narragansett Bay, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 9703) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 9704) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Flushing, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9705) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Far Rockaway, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9706) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9707) to increase the limit of cost of a Federal building at Long Island City, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9708) for the restoration, under certain conditions, of lands included in power-site withdrawals; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9709) providing for the appointment of a board of survey for the purpose of selecting a suitable site for a naval armor plant at or near Paducah, Ky., and submitting an estimate of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9710) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation for rebuilding, improving, and strengthening the levee on the Mississippi River at Columbus, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 9712) providing for the issuing of patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 114) to create a commission which shall determine the advisability of establishing a "summer capital" of the United States and the location and cost of the same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the passage of House bill 6798, authorizing the distribution of the proceeds of the sale of timber from public lands to the State in which the timber is cut; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9713) granting a pension to William A. Sims; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9714) granting an increase of pension to Benton Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9715) granting a pension to Nettie L. Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9716) granting a pension to Mark Curt-singer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9717) for the relief of the estate of William J. Sailing, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 9718) granting an increase of pension to Caroline A. Starbuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 9719) granting an increase of pension to Harry M. Batty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9720) granting an increase of pension to Maria J. G. Hammack; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9721) granting a pension to Jesse Trower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9722) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Weller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9723) granting a pension to Alpheus R. Bascom; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 9724) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Hutchison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9725) for the relief of Thomas Riley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9726) granting a pension to Alice A. Parrott Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9727) granting a pension to Charles Augustus Cline; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 9728) granting a pension to Robert P. Ausbrooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9729) granting a pension to Chester A. Morang; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 9730) granting a pension to Anna McD. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 9731) granting an increase of pension to Eugene B. Guild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 9732) for the relief of William Schafer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 9733) granting an increase of pension to John A. Boggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9734) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 9735) granting a pension to W. J. Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 9736) granting a pension to F. M. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9737) for the relief of John A. Bingham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 9738) granting an increase of pension to Edward Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9739) granting an increase of pension to Martha Tibbitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 9740) granting an increase of pension to James West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9741) granting an increase of pension to William A. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9742) granting an increase of pension to Charles Van Ostrand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9743) granting a pension to Phoebe J. Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9744) granting a pension to Etta E. Vinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 9745) granting a pension to Sabina O'Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 9746) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Anastacio C. de Baca, administrator of Francisco C. de Baca, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9747) for the relief of the estate of Francisco Montoya; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9748) granting a pension to Bernard Higgins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9749) for the relief of the New Mexico Insane Asylum, of Las Vegas, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 9750) granting an increase of pension to Rhuamah Vincent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9751) granting an increase of pension to George D. Seelye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9752) granting an increase of pension to Laura B. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9753) granting a pension to John P. Burrow, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9754) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9755) waiving age limit in appointment as chaplain in the Army in the case of Isaac Edwin Munger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9756) for the relief of Mary Ellen Thompson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9757) granting a pension to Mary E. Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9758) granting a pension to John W. Munsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9759) granting a pension to William C. Winslow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9760) for the relief of James T. Petty, Charles W. Church, and others, executors of Charles B. Church, deceased; Jesse B. Wilson, and George T. Dearing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9761) for the relief of the legal representatives of Owen Thorne, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 9762) granting a pension to Jonah E. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 9763) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Herbst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9764) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9765) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9766) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 9767) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Hagerstown & Middleburg Turnpike Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9768) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9769) for the relief of Harold Holst; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 9770) granting a pension to Samuel E. Simerly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9771) granting an increase of pension to W. B. C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9772) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Kitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9773) granting an increase of pension to John Carey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9774) granting an increase of pension to John N. Bayles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 9775) for the relief of Davis & Lawrence Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9776) granting a pension to Katharine Wilkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9777) granting a pension to Johanna Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9778) granting a pension to James L. McPherson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 9779) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Shultis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9780) granting an increase of pension to William H. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9781) granting a pension to Sylvania Engle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9782) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Maddox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 9783) for the relief of the heir of Josephus Wallace; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9784) for the relief of the heirs of Amos R. Harrell and John Brady, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9785) for the relief of the heirs of John O'Kelley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9786) for the relief of the heirs of H. L. Harvey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9787) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9788) granting an increase of pension to Dunois M. Beman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 9789) granting a pension to Frank E. Saxon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 9790) for the relief of Dr. J. W. Stokes; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9791) granting a pension to Louisa Way; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9792) granting a pension to Serelda Pargin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 9793) granting a pension to Louis Winbray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 9794) granting a pension to Clara S. Ickis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 9795) granting a pension to Hannah J. Secombe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9796) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9797) granting an increase of pension to Attison W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9798) granting a pension to Anna E. Pagett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9799) granting an increase of pension to Charles van Anker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 8508, for relief of Hannah Sawyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9441, for relief of Dorcas A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of Rev. Clayton B. Wells and other citizens of Wichita, Kans., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of McPherson, bankers and other citizens of Canton, bankers and others of Wichita, bankers and others of Newton, all in the State of Kansas, protesting against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petitions of Howland Croft, Sons & Co. and William G. McGuire, of Camden, N. J., favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of sundry tradespeople of Pennsylvania, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of monthly meeting of Friends at Ercildown and Lansdown, Pa., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of citizens of St. Paul, Kans., protesting against any amendment requiring revenue stamps to be placed on individual bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of citizens of Hepler, Kans., protesting against any amendment to the internal-revenue law as applied to affixing revenue stamps to individual bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Columbus, Miss., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Fownes Bros., Amsterdam, N. Y., relative to increase in price of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: Petitions of business men of the third congressional district of Georgia, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEWALT: Petitions of Schuylkill Silk Mills and Wernersville (Pa.) Hosiery Mill, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial of Commercial Club of Huron, relative to congestion of freight at ocean docks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Madison (S. Dak.) Merchants' Association, protesting against amendment to the Parcel Post System to do away with the zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of A. D. Varian, in favor of House bill 476, workingman's compensation bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of George H. Fortson Camp, No. 2, of Seattle, Wash.; Jack Foster Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, of Hot Springs, S. Dak.; and Foreign Service Camp, No. 26, of Newark, N. J., in favor of granting pensions to widows and orphans of men who served in the Spanish-American War, Philippine insurrection, and the China expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Chagres Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, Canal Zone; Bennington Camp, No. 20, United Spanish War Veterans, San Diego, Cal.; Major W. M. A. Kirk Camp, No. 12, United Spanish War Veterans, Sioux City, Iowa, in favor of granting pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of General Henry W. Lawton Camp, No. 4, United Spanish War Veterans, of Washington, D. C., favoring the granting of pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of William McKinley Camp, No. 33, of West Hoboken, N. J., favoring granting of pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Guy V. Henry Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring granting pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Ben E. Rolph Camp, No. 22, of Coldwater, Mich., in favor of granting pensions to the widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of General Joe Wheeler Camp, No. 2, of Tampa, Fla., favoring granting pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of Walter L. Hake and 30 others of Curtiss, and Fred L. Strauss and 12 others of La Crosse, all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Woman's Party of Cook County, Ill., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHE: Papers to accompany House bill 8543, for the relief of Abraham Boudin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petitions of merchants of Lstant, Ill., favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring House bill 476, employee's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Mitten & Hosiery Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Archibald I. Levy, of New York; Edwin Boess, of South Norwalk; Dunlap & Co., of New York; Penn Knitting Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.; J. D. Stowe & Sons, of Scitico, Conn.; W. D. Ball and E. L. Cooper, of Carthage; Alberta Knitting Mills, of Germantown, Philadelphia; Brontz Textile Mills, of Brontz, N. Y.; St. George Pulp & Paper Co., of Norwalk, Conn.; and Saugatuck (Conn.) Manufacturing Co., favoring tariff on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Petitions of Lieut. Edward J. Ruf, Lieut. George A. Bilsbarrow, Capt. E. J. McMahon, and other officers and men of the National Guard of Missouri, favoring passage of the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Harrison Bros., of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFFAN: Papers to accompany bill for pension for Robert A. Herbst; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Woman's Party of Cook County, Ill., relative to peace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Memorial of Hanover (Ill.) Woolen Manufacturing Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Henry J. Hiller, John Hess, George A. Kokat, and others, of Philadelphia, favoring bill to prohibit shipment of munitions to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Ontario Spinning Co., Arrott Steam Power Mills Co., Franklin Hosiery Co., and Bender, Rochie & Ward, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of C. H. Dexter & Sons, of Windsor Locks, Conn., and Cheney Bros., of South Manchester, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Windsor Locks Chamber of Commerce, favoring the improvement of the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke and making it navigable between said cities; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the De Witt-Boag Co., B. C. De Witt, president, of Hornell, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 702, entitled "A bill to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. C. Murdock, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring the passage of the prohibition amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of State of New York, favoring retention of duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of department of education, borough of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Women of '76 Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring permanent nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of Daniel Lee Jamison, of Albany, N. Y., favoring bill for censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of tradespeople of Troy, N. Y., favoring fax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 5592, for pension for Sarah H. Benedict; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of William J. Emery and other citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring pensions for widows of Spanish-War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of G. L. Calkins, of Battle Creek, Mich., favoring Federal censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7975, in pension case of Jonathan D. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Supreme Underwear Co., Climax Underwear Co., and Ritesize Underwear Co., of Utica, N. Y., for tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Moving Picture and Projecting Machine Operators' Local Union No. 150, protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Easton, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lutheran Church of the Atonement, Easton, Pa., favoring Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. STINESS: Petitions of Rhode Island Processing Co., of Coventry, and Waurego Co. and Quinebaug Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of L. I. Slocum, Lucy A. Slocum, H. L. Clark, R. E. Ayers, J. W. Smith, Eva Irene Smith, H. C. Bunker, and Mrs. Bunker, members of Dover local, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, Dover, Weld County, Colo., opposing increase of national armaments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: Petitions of Contoocook Mills Co., of Hillsboro; Granite State Mills, of Guild; Ashland Knitting Co., of Ashland; C. J. Amidon & Son, of Hinsdale; Hillsboro Mills Co., of Hillsboro; Henry Paper Co. and J. E. Henry & Sons Paper Co., of Lincoln, all in the State of New Hampshire, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of business men and others of Worcester County, Mass., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Millbury, Mass., favoring restoration of rural free delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 22, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, that through the terrible conflict now raging in half the world the good in man is pouring itself out to alleviate the sorrow and suffering of war's desolation. And we most earnestly pray that the good may reach the ascendancy in every heart; that wars may cease and man learn anew the lesson that where hate abounds strife, contentions, and wars abound, but where love abounds peace, joy, and harmony abounds; that the religion of brotherly love may have its sway and make the Old World blossom as the rose, and glory and honor and praise to Thee swell the mighty chorus round the world, "Peace on earth, good will toward men," forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent Mr. TILLMAN was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Charles W. Reeves, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, upon the request of Mr. WILSON of Louisiana, Mr. H. GARLAND DUPRE was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of important business.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, with Mr. BORLAND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, Government aid to the States in the construction of roads has been a subject of controversy ever since the thirteen original States formed the Union. For 30 or 40 years after this Government was established it engaged in road building. Something like \$14,000,000 was expended on the Cumberland Road, and the work on this highway did not cease until after, or about, the beginning of the era of railroads.

For the past 80 years nothing of any importance has been done in that line by the General Government except the creation in the Department of Agriculture of the Office of Public Roads. This bureau, it affords me pleasure to testify, incidentally, has not only given very valuable object lessons in the construction of experimental roads, showing the best materials for different kinds of roads and the best methods of using them, but has materially aided the several States in their work of road building.

In the great scheme of Government aid to public-road construction, however, this is but a drop in the bucket. The States spent \$249,055,067 in road construction in the year 1914, and each year the amount increases. Meanwhile Congress has done nothing but talk about the matter. Bills enough have been introduced—some good, some bad, some indifferent—but none reached the point of enactment. Action, definite, conclusive action, has been too long delayed. It is high time something was done.

The State of Alabama, which I have the honor in part to represent, has made great progress in road construction within the last few years. The constitution of that State was amended by a vote of the people in the year 1901 so as to authorize the legislature to appropriate the net proceeds of the State convict department to aid in road building. Five years ago the legislature created a State highway commission and made an appropriation of \$2,000 per annum to each county out of the funds of the State convict department to aid in road building. I had the honor to be the author of this legislation. Up to that time but little interest had been taken in substantial road improvement in many of the rural counties in Alabama. Under the provisions of that law the county was required to put up an equal amount to that appropriated by the State. While these amounts were small and only a few miles of model highway could be built in each county, it was enough to demonstrate to the people the advantages of good roads and aided in the creation of a better sentiment for good roads. There were only 3,780 miles of improved roads in Alabama when this State highway commission was created on the 1st of April, 1911, and four years later there were 7,195 miles of improved roads in the State, an increase of more than 90 per cent. This was chiefly the result of the small amount of State aid. Alabama is taking the lead among the Southern States in road building. [Applause.]

If such a small amount of State aid accomplished this much, a larger amount of national aid, as provided by the bill under consideration, would accomplish much more. This refutes the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that national aid would impair interest on the part of the States in road building. National aid will strengthen sentiment and interest for better roads in the States.

Several bills providing for national aid to roads have been introduced at this session. The one under consideration was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Roads, and reported by that committee, of which I am a member. Some features of the bill I do not like. The old Members of the House who have been working for years for national aid to roads, a number of whom are members of the Committee on Roads, favor this bill and say that it is the best one that has ever been before Congress, and the only one that can pass both Houses of Congress.